THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

APRIL 1959

Marxism Today

GEORGE MATTHEWS	DOWN ON BEVAN'S FARM
LANCE SAMSON	TOWARDS A SUMMIT MEETING
D. N. AIDIT	BASIC PROBLEMS OF THE INDONESIAN REVOLUTION
LIONEL FORMAN	THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA
V. GOMULKA	THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION, REVISIONISM AND THE PARTY
DISCUSSION:	
ALEC WATERMAN SOLLY KAYE	ON THE JEWISH QUESTION
C. DUKES	ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Monthly 1/6

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Today

Vol. 3 No. 4

CONTENTS

		page
George MATTHEWS	**Down on Bevan's Farm** ... ... Examines the reported discussion between Bevan, Mendes-France and Nenni.	97
Lance SAMSON	**Towards a Summit Meeting** ... Discusses the situation in relation to Berlin and Germany and Labour policy.	103
D. N. AIDIT	**Basic Problems of the Indonesian Revolution** ... ... Examines the nature of the Indonesian Revolution and the policy it requires.	109
Lionel FORMAN	**The Development of Nations in South Africa** ... ... A contribution from a South African on the national question.	115
V. GOMULKA	**The Cultural Revolution, Revisionism and the Party**... Extract from the Report to the Third Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party on March 10, 1959.	119
DISCUSSION: Alec WATERMAN Solly KAYE	**On the Jewish Question** ...	123
C. DUKES	**On Higher Education** ... ... Arising out of the article by Sam Lilley, January 1959.	127

Editor John Gollan

Assistant Editor
James Klugmann

Editorial Board
Professor J. D. Bernal
Emile Burns
Les Burt
Maurice Cornforth
Maurice Dobb
Arnold Kettle
John Lewis
John Mahon
Frank Stanley
Professor George Thomson
John Wood

Editorial correspondence
James Klugmann,
16 King Street, W.C.2.

Advertisements
Margaret Williamson,
above address.

Orders and Subscriptions
usual agents or
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C.1.

Subscription rates
Six issues 10s. 6d.
Twelve issues 21s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Down on Bevan's farm

George Matthews

RECENTLY the French newspaper *l'Express* brought together Mendès-France, former French Premier, Nenni, leader of the Italian Socialist Party, and Aneurin Bevan for a discussion. They met at Mr. Bevan's Buckinghamshire farm, and a summary of their discussion was published in *The Observer* of March 8th, 1959.

According to *The Observer,* the gathering met "to discuss why, fourteen years after the war, the Right is everywhere in power in Western Europe, and what the policy of the non-Communist Left should be." This is certainly a most important subject for discussion. If in 1945 anyone on the Left had prophesied that within a few years not a single Social Democratic or Labour Government would be in office in Western Europe, he would have been laughed at as a defeatist.

After years of anti-Fascist war the people of Europe were in the mood for radical change. They were questioning the foundations of the capitalist system, which had brought two world wars in one generation. After their sacrifice during the war they were not prepared to accept the social conditions of the pre-war years. So great was their desire for a break with the past that in Britain even the war-time leader Churchill was thrust aside by the electorate, and de Gaulle in France was soon pushed into the political background, to be held in reserve by the big bourgeoisie.

The Left (using this term in the sense of the whole Labour and progressive movement) had the ball at its feet, and whatever the differences of opinion about the rate of progress, there were few who thought that the open capitalist parties and the forces of the Right would before long be back in the saddle again.

Yet in 1959 there is a Tory Government in Britain which is celebrating the eighth consecutive year of Tory rule. De Gaulle is in office in France, having carried through a series of measures to deprive Parliament of authority, weaken the Republican system, and prepare the way for fascism. In Italy the governmental crisis has recently been "solved" by the formation of a Government still further to the Right than its predecessor.

Why has all this hapened? Why have the hopes of 1945 been replaced by the realities of 1959?

It is well worth bringing together such notabilities as Mendès-France, Nenni and Bevan to get an answer, or even part of an answer, to this question. But, if *The Observer* account of their talk is anything like an accurate or comprehensive one, we are compelled to ask as we read it "Was this journey really necessary?" For there is something pathetic about the spectacle of these three prominent figures solemnly sitting down to discuss this vital issue, every word of their conversation to be taken down and one of the world's best photographers there to record the occasion for posterity—and then the revelation that they did not even attempt to get to grips with the problem under discussion.

Bankruptcy of the Right

They start off, indeed, by evading the question —by pretending that the problem doesn't really exist.

Nenni says, "What each of our countries is suffering from today is the bankruptcy of the Right."

Mendès-France points out the special problem of France, which he says consists in the fact that "The Right flatters the most chauvinist nationalism, excites passions and thus diverts attention from the fundamental economic and social problem."

Bevan says, "In America there are 5 million unemployed, and many under-employed. This situation is now being contrasted with what is happening in the Communist world, where you have mounting production and economic buoyancy. If this continues, it is completely deadly for the self-confidence of the Right, and yet they find no way of solving it."

But all these statements simply beg the question.

Nenni is correct—the Right is bankrupt, in the sense that it has no answer to the basic problems of the countries of Western Europe. But surely that makes it all the more extraordinary that the Right remains in office. A bankrupt who yet stays in business is an odd phenomenon. Thus Nenni's "answer" only provokes more questions.

Mendès-France is also correct in pointing out that the Right in France plays on chauvinist and nationalist feelings in regard to the Algerian war. But is this a sufficient explanation of de Gaulle's resurrection? Has there ever been a time when the Right has *not* played on chauvinist feelings? Surely whether it succeeds or not depends primarily on whether the Left combats these at-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempts. It depends on the Left not succumbing itself to chauvinist tendencies, courageously fighting against colonial wars, and sticking to the principles of proletarian internationalism.

To what extent has the Left in France done this? Mendès-France does not even attempt to answer. His presentation of the problem also merely raises new questions instead of providing the answers.

As for Bevan, there is nothing wrong with his description of the present scene—the decline and stagnation in the capitalist world, and the "mounting production and economic buoyancy" in the socialist world. But after all, you don't even need to call yourself Left these days to recognise that. It was Macmillan who told his Moscow audiences that their future was "one of expanding horizons", that their progress had "no parallel in history", and then added that in Britain "the period of the rapid expansion of our basic industries is a thing of the past."

But what conclusions are drawn from the contrast? Why are Russian workers producing more and more, while British miners have to demonstrate against the closing of pits? Why is "the self-confidence of the Right" being struck "deadly blows" by the advances in the socialist world, while in the West Social-Democracy cannot shift the Right from office?

Bevan doesn't say.

This can hardly be called a serious treatment of the subject. For the situation is even more grave than is implied by the statement that "the Right is everywhere in power in Western Europe." Not only is the Right in power, but it is increasingly displaying anti-democratic and fascist tendencies. Finding it difficult to impose a reactionary policy through the traditional methods of parliamentary democracy, the big bourgeoisie in a number of countries is more and more attracted by the idea of dictatorship.

It was this that lay behind the events in France last year, the *coup d'état* of the Algiers ultras, the coming to power of de Gaulle, the plebiscite and the end of the Fourth Republic.

As the crisis of capitalism deepens, the tendencies towards adventurism in foreign affairs and attacks on democracy at home are likely to increase in the Western countries. It was to these dangers that the joint statement of the French and Italian Communist Parties drew attention last December.

But there is not a word about these menacing developments in the report of the discussions on Bevan's farm. There is no hint that they need to be met by rallying all the forces of democracy and peace in a broad front of resistance. Nor is there any suggestion that future Left or Labour Governments should strike at the roots of these reactionary currents by measures which will weaken the economic and political power of the big monopolists.

We look in vain for any penetrating analysis of the European situation, and instead find only the most superficial treatment. Here is Bevan on the Common Market:

> "A lot of gimmicks are being tried out. One of them is the Common Market. This is not so much an economic philosophy as a piece of economic escapism. It leaves the fundamental economic question untouched; indeed in some respects it aggravates it."

Here is a classic example of Bevan's habit of playing with words while avoiding any class analysis of a problem.

The European Common Market is a ganging-up of the big monopolists in the six countries concerned, with the West German monopolists playing a dominant role. Its object is to strengthen the position of these big monopolists at the expense of their own working people and at the expense of the other countries of Western Europe, especially Britain. Yet Bevan dismisses it as "a gimmick" and a piece of "economic escapism", and adds, "I am not saying it is a bad thing, but it is not in itself a solution of the economic problem in the Western world."

Is this superficial approach due to the fact that the three leaders are nit-wits? It is true that the more we read the account of their discussion, the less respect we have for them. But they are able, intelligent men, or they would not be where they are. They do not face the realities of the position because this would inevitably lead them to the conclusion that the bankruptcy of the Right is paralleled, if not exceeded, by the bankruptcy of Social Democracy.

Division on the Left

They would be forced to conclude, if they really faced the question they came together to discuss, that the Right is in power not because of its own strength, but because of the weakness and division on the Left.

No one can maintain that the Tories are in office in Britain because of their own impregnable position. There has seldom, if ever, been a more vulnerable administration than that of Macmillan. It has antagonised tenants by the Rent Act. It has displayed unprecedented meanness towards the old age pensioners. It has sent the unemployment figure soaring, and kept production stagnant.

Abroad the Tories involved Britain in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disaster and fiasco of Suez. They were responsible for the bloodbath in Cyprus. Now they are arousing all Africa against Britain. They are proposing to rearm Hitler's successors with the nuclear weapons he did not succeed in producing.

The great political mystery of today is why with this record the Tories are able to hang on—why Labour does not harry them day in and day out until their position becomes impossible.

In the very issue in which the Bevan conversations are reported, *The Observer's* Political Correspondent refers to the Tory failures, and comments:

> "What is so extraordinary is that, up to now, the Opposition has been unable to exploit these failures. For the last two years the Labour Party has never realised the importance of Suez; indeed the leadership has consistently tried to prevent its rank and file from attacking the Government on this issue . . . if the Opposition is returned at the next election it will largely be because of a negative—because people have lost faith in the Tories and see the Socialists as the lesser of two evils."

Gaitskell had the chance of going to Moscow long before Macmillan. He threw it away. Instead he went to see de Gaulle and came back praising him, He had the chance of winning the support and gratitude of hundreds of thousands of miners by opposing pit closures. He went to South Wales and told the miners who were being thrown out of work that pit closures were "inevitable" and were being well handled by the Coal Board.

Or take France. Is there no significance in the fact that when it came to choosing a representative of the "non-Communist Left" it was not a Socialist who was chosen, but Mendès-France?

If de Gaulle is in office today that is due first and foremost to the treachery of Guy Mollet and the other Right-wing leaders of the French Socialist Party. It was their refusal to base themselves on the working class and form an alliance with the French Communist Party that opened the door to reaction.

In Italy, where the situation is very different, the same lessons can be learnt. Nenni is far from being a Mollet. Nevertheless he has in the recent period refused to co-operate fully with the Italian Communist Party, and has rejected its proposals for united action. This inevitably weakens the Left forces in Italy and enables clerical reaction to maintain its grip.

Bevan is full of praise for this policy: "I say to our comrade from the F.S.I., it is absolutely important that in these circumstances they maintain the purity of their position."

But then he never hesitates to advise, from the lofty heights of the Opposition front bench, those whom he calls "our Continental friends." Their trouble, he says, is that they appear to be "permanently empirical."

It is, of course, true that one of the characteristics of Social Democracy is contempt for theory and lack of principle. But no Social Democratic movement has been more guilty of these mistakes than the British. For a British Labour leader to accuse the Continental Left of empiricism is indeed an astonishing case of failing to see the beam in one's own eye.

Bevan's main complaint against the Continental Social-Democrats is that they enter into parliamentary alliances with the Right. This is the "empiricism" he objects to. But is this different in principle from making so many concessions to the Right that it is difficult to distinguish the policy of the Labour Party from that of the Tories?

In the conditions of France or Italy the betrayal of Socialist principles may express itself in parliamentary alliances with the parties of the Right. In the different conditions of Britain it is no less a betrayal if it expresses itself in a bipartisan policy on key issues, in consultation "behind the Speaker's Chair," and in a tacit agreement that whatever the shadow-boxing in Parliament, Her Majesty's Government and Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition both support Her Majesty's Empire and Her Majesty's capitalist system.

Attacks on "empiricism" come strangely from the man who has justified making peace with the Right wing of the Labour Party on the ground that compromise is necessary to win the next election, and that "unity", even if behind a Right-wing policy, justifies the surrender of socialist principles.

At one point in the discussion Bevan remarked, "The governing class always needs to have protective coloration; it always borrows somebody from the Left to give it a mask, then uses them up." How true! And what lessons there are in this for the British Labour movement as well as for the Continental Social-Democrats to whom Bevan's remark was directed.

The American Alliance

As appears later in *The Observer* account of the conversations, Bevan himself uses in this particular discussion the most opportunist arguments, utterly lacking in principle, to justify the Labour Party attitude to the American alliance.

For he is not satisfied with putting right the Continental Social-Democrats. He also knows what is wrong with the Communists. According to him, the Communist Parties in Western Europe have failed. Here he is merely repeating what he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrote in *Tribune* in November 1958 in an article headed "The Communist Failure in the West."

Written at a moment when the French Communist Party was under the heaviest fire from reaction, and when de Gaulle's success was encouraging the most reactionary elements to attack the Italian Communist Party, Bevan's article was from beginning to end an attack on these two Communist Parties and an effort to blame them for the advance of the Right.

It is true that the results of the referendum in France had shown that many Communist voters voted "yes" for de Gaulle's constitution. But Bevan did not try to analyse what had happened to bring this about. He succeeded, in fact, in writing his whole *Tribune* article without once mentioning Mollet. For him the crucial point was that the Communist Party had "failed". And, of course, he wrote as if it was going to go from bad to worse.

Contrast the attitude of the French Communists. They did not attempt to disguise the seriousness of what had happened. They did not deny that there had been weaknesses in the application of the correct political line. But they kept their heads and pointed out that:

> "The Communist Party by its very nature as an advance guard, can, on occasion, find itself in the position of being against the stream. . . . The Political Bureau recalls that this has happened a number of times in the history of our Party—at the time of Munich for example, and again in 1939 when war was threatening . . . and only a few months afterwards, helped by the experience of the people, the Party recovered its prestige amongst the masses." (Report of Marcel Servin, October 1958).

Bevan's *Tribune* article appeared on November 28th. On November 30th voting in the second round of the French legislative elections took place. As compared with the first round a week before, the French Communists gained 426,000. Not months, but weeks, were enough for the Party to begin to "recover its prestige amongst the masses."

Yet Bevan learns no lessons. His conversation with Mendès-France and Nenni took place at the end of February this year. It was published in *The Observer* on March 8th, the day on which the first round of the French municipal elections took place. So once again on the eve of French elections Bevan spoke of "Communist failure." And once again he was confounded by events.

The day after the report of his remarks appeared we could read in our newspapers of the remarkable success of the French Communist Party, and the fact that it had regained the support lost during the days of confusion and betrayal last year.

But Bevan maintains the tale of Communist "failure" and says it is due to the fact that the West European Communist Parties "have let themselves be governed by the international situation."

Their policies, Bevan says, have been governed by "obedience to the fatherland of the Revolution." But what have the Western Communist Parties been advocating in the field of foreign affairs?

Ever since the cold war was launched in 1946 they have been campaigning to end it, and replace it by a policy of peaceful co-existence. They have done this above all because it is in the interests of the British, French and Italian workers.

Because the Soviet Union also advocated an end to it, should the Western Communist Parties have supported the cold war? Should they have advocated the carrying on of nuclear tests and the rearmament of West Germany because the Soviet Union was against these measures?

Bevan himself, on many aspects of foreign policy, has to his credit put forward policies very close to those of the Soviet Union in international affairs. This is certainly not due to his "obedience to the fatherland of the Revolution" but to his belief that a change of policy is in the interests of Britain.

Unfortunately it was the post-war Labour Government, not the Communists, which supported the cold war, entered into the N.A.T.O. alliance and brought the American bombers here. Bevan seems to live in another world from the one we know. He ignores all that the Social Democratic Parties have done in the past to foment the cold war.

Independence?

In his opinion, "The Left Parties should all the time frame their policies quite independently of the international situation as it is at any given moment."

What this means is anybody's guess. Nenni showed more sense of reality when he commented, "I continue to believe we have all been the victims these last ten years of increasing international tension. . . . I am sure that the working class movement and the peace movement fuse together."

"The international situation" is not an abstraction. It is the class struggle on an international level.

It is dominated by two great factors—the efforts of imperialism to hold back the advance of socialism, and even prepare for war against the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

socialist countries; and the attempt to stem the tide of the great national liberation movement, resulting in such wars as those of Suez and Algeria.

What does "being independent" mean in relation to this specific international situation? Does Bevan mean "neutrality"? Some countries do claim to be neutral, and say that they will neither side with the Western nor the socialist countries.

In practice, to the extent that these countries want to work for peace, they inevitably find that they agree more with the socialist countries than the imperialist countries. This has been the position of India, for example. And this would seem to be the logic of an approach which argues that "both blocs" are equally to blame for international tension.

But Bevan makes clear he is not for neutrality. His "independence" does not extend so far as independence from the United States. He is all for the American alliance. So is Mendès-France. Nenni is less enthusiastic, merely saying "as far as Italy is concerned we are not at this moment contemplating its retreat from the Atlantic alliance."

Bevan's argument is that

> "from my point of view it is an advantage at the moment to maintain the alliance with the United States because it is always unwise to dismantle such alliances as you have until you can supply substitutes for them."

We would not presume to judge whether this is an "empirical" argument or not. It certainly seems to lack any principle, and where the "independence" comes in only Bevan knows.

Nenni qualified his remarks about "not retreating from the Atlantic alliance" by adding that the important thing was the "liquidation of the military blocs."

But even this was too much for Bevan, who replied:

> "There is no more justification for the Warsaw bloc than there is for the N.A.T.O. alliance. While you have them both, it is natural that people should want to protect themselves."

The small point that N.A.T.O. was founded in 1949, while the Warsaw Pact did not come into existence until 1955, after West German rearmament had been decided on, seems to have escaped the attention of Labour's Shadow Foreign Secretary. So also does the fact that the Warsaw Pact countries have proposed the liquidation of *both* N.A.T.O. and the Warsaw Pact, while the West refuse even to consider such a proposal.

This pretence that there is no difference between an aggressive alliance of capitalist states and a defensive alliance of socialist states is then carried further by Bevan. Britain, he says, should not withdraw from N.A.T.O., because this "could completely destroy any influence we might have on the conduct of American and Russian foreign policy." It would leave "Washington and Moscow opposite each other in two single blocs. The rest of us would become spectators of the manoeuvres of these two giants."

So here is Bevan's picture. Two "giants" facing each other. We want to use our "independent" influence for peace. How shall we do it? By joining in on the side of the capitalist "giant" against the socialist one!

What a fantastic perversion of the type of policy a Left government in Britain could and should pursue in order to further the cause of peaceful co-existence. Bevan's "independence" turns out to be subservience to the United States imperialists. Faced with the choice, he does not choose friendship and co-operation with the socialist countries, or even neutrality, but a military alliance with American monopoly capitalism.

Anti-Communism

The tragedy of this whole discussion is that it shows that the lessons of a generation of working class experience have still not been learned by some who claim to be on the Left.

On Bevan's farm, the "non-Communist Left" turned out to be the *anti-Communist* Left.

But anti-Communism and a genuine Left policy are incompatible.

Those who say "I will fight the Communists as well as the capitalists" usually end up by supporting the capitalists against the Communists.

Thus Bevan's main complaint against the Americans is that

> "America no more now than fifteen years ago has any other idea of fighting Communism except to put Europe back into the situation which led to the last war. . . . There comes from the United States no positive idea at all of how to fight Communism except by the recreation of pre-war capitalism."

So he proposes that a British Labour Government should stay in N.A.T.O. so as to teach the Americans how to fight Communism. The backward stupid, clumsy, nineteenth-century anti-Communists who run General Motors, Du Pont, and Standard Oil are going to be taught a thing or two by a Labour Foreign Secretary.

Who does he think he is kidding?

Anti-Communism is the curse of the West European working class movement. More than anything else it is responsible for the present domination of the Right. De Gaulle in France,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Christian Democrats in Italy, Macmillan in Britain—all owe their position to the anti-Communism of Social Democracy, which prevents the achievement of working class unity.

This anti-Communism is not confined to the extreme Right-wing Social Democrats like Mollet. The fight against the referendum in France was seriously hampered by the refusal of Socialists and Republicans like Mendès-France and Daniel Mayer, who were campaigning for "No" to de Gaulle's constitution, to form an alliance with the Communists. This refusal made a victory for the "Noes" seem unrealistic to many voters, and contributed to de Gaulle's victory. Nor did it help Mendès-France, who was later to lose his own seat in the National Assembly.

Bevan's remark about the deadly blows to the "self-confidence of the Right" have already been mentioned.

But what about the self-confidence of the Left? It is the Right-wing Social-Democrat leaders who have done more than anything else to diminish the confidence of the working class in its own strength. They fear the initiative and activity of the masses, because it challenges their line of compromise with capitalism. This, too, is why they do not draw the logical conclusion from the contrast between the advance of the socialist world and the crisis of the capitalist world.

The source of that socialist advance lies in the fact that in 1917 the Russian people rejected the timid arguments of the Mensheviks that the time was not ripe for the workers and peasants to take power, that they were not yet fit to run the country and still needed the bourgeoisie.

Led by the Communist Party, the Russian workers and peasants took power from the hands of the capitalists and landlords and began to build socialism.

At the end of the Second World War other countries in Western Europe, and shortly afterwards China, took their own road to the same goal of socialism, again under the leadership of the Communist Parties.

The "advanced" workers of Western Europe, whose countries had seen the birth of the Labour movement, were left behind. Social-Democracy was able to divide and weaken the movement in these countries and make possible a come-back of the Right.

This is surely the great lesson of the past fourteen years. It is being learnt by the real Left—the socialist forces and the active workers in Europe's Labour movement. This is shown by the success of the French Communists and the joint Communist-Socialist electoral alliance in France.

There are hopeful signs of advance also in Italy, and though in Britain the Communist Party is small in comparison with its French and Italian brother parties, the success of its re-registration campaign and the beginning of an improvement in recruiting to the Party is an important portent for the future.

It is possible to end the domination of the Right. A great advance of the Left can be achieved in 1959. But this will not come about as the result of the sterile anti-Communism and pitiful failure to face realities which characterised the discussion down on Bevan's farm.

It is the Communists who, in France, Italy and Britain point the way forward for the Left, with their call for working class unity to defeat the attack on living conditions and democratic freedoms and to bring about the social and economic transformation of their countries.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Towards a Summit meeting

Lance Samson

"WAR is much too serious a thing to be left to military men," quoted Briand to Lloyd George in the First World War. Today, one world war later, peace is much too serious a thing to be left to either politicians or diplomats.

To the chagrin of the generals and the Cabinet Ministers of the capitalist countries "their" peoples have since 1945 taken an increasing hand in deciding policies affecting peace or war. Suez, the pressure for the 1955 summit meeting, the ending of the Viet Nam war, Korea—these are some of the outstanding instances when the people intervened.

Now attention is focused on Germany, for though the end of the last war to end all wars is fourteen years past, no peace treaty has yet been signed. During almost every one of those years the Soviet Union has proposed at least once—often several times over—that this question should be urgently discussed. With unfailing regularity, the Western powers refused.

At the beginning of this year the Soviet Union again proposed a peace conference, and put forward a draft German peace treaty which would take Germany out of the cold war and take atomic weapons out of Germany. The Soviet Union has also suggested steps to remove the fuse from the Berlin powder keg.

In the early part of next month (May) the Foreign Ministers of Britain, the Soviet Union, America, France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal German Republic are expected to meet. Only a continuation and increase of the pressures which forced the Western powers to consider such a conference at last can ensure that any accord emerges from this meeting or from the conference of heads of Government which may follow. For this vital question of Germany has come to a crucial stage.

German Militarism and Nazism

"German militarism and Nazism will be extirpated and the Allies will take in agreement together, now and in the future, the other measures necessary to ensure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbours or the peace of the world."

So ran the Potsdam Declaration of August 2nd, 1945, signed by Attlee, Stalin and Truman and acceded to later by France. That was the sane, agreed policy to be carried out by the wartime Allies. But instead, the Western powers imposed the splitting of Germany, allowed Hitler's Generals and other ex-Nazis back on top in West Germany, and are thrusting atomic weapons into their hands, with the power to engulf the world in an infinitely more frightful holocaust than the last.

In this, London, Washington and Paris believe they have achieved what some of the leaders of the capitalist world have never ceased to hope and plot for since the birth of the Soviet Union: lining up Germany, or in this case the larger part of Germany, against the Soviet Union, a repetition of the attempt after the First World War to build up the German militarists against "Bolshevism"—an attempt, it should be remembered today, which culminated in those very militarists turning first on their erstwhile backers.

Apparently these cold war warriors have learnt nothing, but have forgotten much. Yet some are beginning to appreciate the danger to themselves which they have created. This fear of the H-sorcerers of what their West German apprentice may do and in what he may entangle them is one factor which can weigh in favour of fruitful talks. But it is difficult to teach old dogs new tricks, and some of the leaders of the capitalist world are not only old but sick.

And the further the atomic rearming of West Germany goes, the more difficult will a settlement become.

Potsdam and the other Allied agreements added up to this: There was to be Allied military occupation for a time, for the specific purpose of denazifying and democratising Germany, destroying the military machine, and breaking up the giant cartels which had brought Hitler to power and grown richer and yet more powerful in furnishing his war materials.

Then a democratic Government for the whole of Germany was to be set up and a peace treaty signed with it to perpetuate the principles of a peaceful Germany outlined in the Potsdam Declaration.

That was the Allied plan, and it is worth recalling, with the events that followed, because Dulles, Macmillan, Adenauer and Co., have done

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their best in the intervening years to make people forget.

The occupation was intended to be only for the time needed to carry out this policy. For this period Germany was divided into four zones, each occupied by one of the Allies, who were to exercise authority "each in his own zone of occupation, and also jointly, in matters affecting Germany as a whole, as members of the Control Council."

Berlin, 100 miles inside the Soviet occupation zone, was the obvious capital for the future German Government, and meanwhile the best seat for the allied administration. So the city was divided into four sectors and given a special Four-Power Commandantura to run it under the general direction of the Control Council. The city was not regarded as a fifth occupation zone or distinct from the Soviet zone in which it lay.

The plans agreed by the wartime allies left no room for ambiguity. Yet the very next year, when the Soviet Union suggested at a Paris Foreign Ministers meeting, that the time had come to discuss a peace treaty and a German central administration as a step to an all-German Government, the Western powers turned the proposal down flat. And in March, 1946, Winston Churchill revealed the Western powers' real policy with the notorious Fulton speech, the starting pistol for the cold war.

Cold War Policy

The essence of that policy, with a double-barrelled aim against the Socialist countries and against former colonies and newly independent countries, was to stop the capitalist world from shrinking further, to expand it where possible. It was built around American economic dominance in the postwar world, and the lead America held at that time in atomic weapons. The splitting of Germany and building up of West Germany as part of the Western war machine were at the very heart of the scheme. For the alternative was a united Germany pledged to peace, and the Western leaders, including Britain's Labour Government, had by then ditched all thoughts of continuing seriously the wartime alliance to ensure a lasting peace.

In December 1946, Britain and the U.S. took the first open step with the creation of the Anglo-American bi-zonal arrangement, later expanded to include the French, too, and make a tri-zonal one. The following year, at the Moscow and London Foreign Ministers' conferences, the Soviet Union again raised the question of a peace treaty, protesting at the same time against the division of Germany that was being imposed. The Marshall Plan, the economic forerunner of the military-political N.A.T.O. pact, was introduced that year, sealing the economic division of Europe.

The Western powers continued their rewriting of the Potsdam agreement in 1948 by introducing their own currency into Western Germany and creating the first Berlin crisis. They had refused to agree to an all-German currency reform, but promised not to introduce the Western Mark into West Berlin, which had free economic dealings with the surrounding Soviet zone.

Without warning they broke this pledge, brought the new Mark into West Berlin, and forced the Russians—faced with the disruption of all economic planning—to set up customs barriers with the Soviet zone in self-protection. Despite Soviet offers to ensure that all necessary supplies for the West Berliners were available, the West at once shouted "Blockade" and began the notorious airlift. After it had been going, with glaring publicity, for several months, Mr. Dulles admitted in an off-the-record talk to journalists that

> "there could be a settlement of the Berlin situation at any time, on the basis of a Soviet currency for Berlin and our right to bring in food, raw materials, and fuel to the Western sectors. The present situation is, however, to United States advantage for propaganda purposes. We are getting credit for keeping the people of Berlin from starving, the Russians are getting the blame for their privations."

The dispute, not surprisingly, dragged on for months, during which time the West talked of world war—and came close to the brink.

The cold war atmosphere had been thoroughly created—and in April 1949, the Western powers set up the aggressive anti-Soviet North Atlantic Treaty Organisation; in May they had the constitution for a separate West German State drawn up, and in September formally set up the Federal German Republic. At another Foreign Ministers conference in Paris meanwhile the Soviet Union had again proposed that a peace treaty be drawn up. It was turned down again—this time on the ingenious grounds that Germany was now split. So it was, and faced with this the German Democratic Republic was founded in East Germany in October that year.

From the moment that their West German state was created the Western powers' descent into the ice-age of the Cold War was rapid. Held up temporarily by the mighty battle against German rearmament which resulted in the defeat of the European Defence Community scheme in France, by 1954 the alternative Paris Agreements rearming Adenauer Germany and bringing it into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

N.A.T.O. were pushed through. From rearmament plain to rearmament atomic, and within less than thirteen years of the end of the Second World War, Chancellor Adenaeur had forced atomic rearmament through the Bundestag despite fierce opposition at home and abroad.

Revival of German Forces

Since the middle of last century German militarism has been the main source of aggression in Europe. Now it has once again been given the power to threaten the peace of the world.

The Western powers' betrayal of the Potsdam Declaration—in letter and spirit—could hardly be more complete. The first purpose of the 1944 occupation was laid down by the Declaration as:

> *"The complete disarmament and demilitarisation of Germany. . . . All German land, naval and air forces . . . shall be completely and finally abolished in such a manner as permanently to prevent the revival or reorganisation of German militarism and Nazism."*

Today West Germany has forces 200,000 strong, and War Minister Strauss, a former political officer in Hitler's Army and a strong candidate for succession to the Adenauer crown, boasts that by next year his forces are to reach a strength of 350,000—only 25,000 fewer than Mr. Duncan Sandys' estimate of the numerical strength of British forces in 1962.

Over a third of the Bonn budget goes on arms. Training for use of atomic weapons began as far back as 1956 and is now being given to West German officers in the U.S.

"The maintenance and production of all aircraft and all arms, ammunition and implements of war shall be prevented," said Potsdam. In the Paris Agreements this became a ban only on production of atomic weapons and some types of rockets.

Now the West German forces are getting missiles—including 600-mile Matador missiles and Honest John atomic rockets. But not content with having these, with the Americans nominally keeping control of the warheads, Bonn is going ahead with plans for its own production of atomic weapons.

Since the Paris agreements ban this only on German soil, one scheme is the West German-French St. Louis research institute, in which. under the direction of Professor Schardin, one-time head of the ballistics institute of the Air Warfare Academy in Berlin-Gatow, 100 leading West German rocket technicians are employed.

Knowledge of experiments done points to the work there being on long-range rockets, despite official claims that anti-tank and anti-aircraft rockets are the aim. Other missile work is being done secretly at several big West German firms. The experiences of the men who sent V1's and V2's over Britain are being put to use. . . .

A Nazi Revival

Another Potsdam aim was:

> *"To destroy the National Socialist Party . . . to dissolve all Nazi institutions, to insure that they are not revived in any form, and to prevent all Nazi and militarist activity or propaganda."*

All the 104 generals of the new Wehrmacht served in a similar rank under Hitler. Remember Speidel, now N.A.T.O. Central European Land Forces commander. Remember General Heusinger, former chief of Operations in the General Staff, today Inspector-General of the Adenauer Wehrmacht. "Attack whenever a chance presents itself. This is the method of fighting which the West should use in its encounters with the East," he declared in 1953. Seven generals and admirals of the West German forces were either sentenced as war criminals or were named on Allied war crimes lists.

Eight of the seventeen members of the Bonn Government were leading officials of the Nazi State or held official positions in the S.S., S.A., or the Nazi Party. According to the Adenauer Government's statistics, published in 1956, the Federal Republic's State machine employed 181,202 officials and employees who had previously worked in the Hitler State machine.

In the diplomatic service 85 per cent of leading officials were former members of the Nazi Party. It is similar in the judiciary: two-thirds of all judges and public prosecutors are former supporters of the Nazi Party—among them people with known war-crimes records. These 800 Nazi jurists are said to be responsible for over 1,800 death sentences, including about 500 Danes, 400 Poles, 300 Czechs.

The Trusts and Democracy

Potsdam said:

> *"At the earliest practicable date the German economy shall be decentralised for the purpose of eliminating the present excessive concentration of economic power as exemplified in particular by cartels, syndicates, trusts and other monopolistic arrangements."*

But in West Germany today the process of concentrating economic power in the hands of a small group of monopolists—in many cases the identical men who brought in Hitler—is even greater than prewar. In 1938 the large joint-stock companies with a capital of more than 50 million

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marks represented 37.1 per cent of the entire share capital; by last year they represented 62.5 per cent. Today seventeen monopolist groups control nearly 80 per cent of the entire West German share capital. And among the men in power again are men like Krupp and Flick—sentenced after the war for war crimes.

And when Herr Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach not only refuses to break up his coal and steel empire as promised to the Western powers, but actually consolidates it further, all that the London *Times* can find to say is: "There is nothing to be gained by pressing too literally the terms of settlement, which cannot be executed without hard feelings" (January 30th, 1959).

Potsdam also said:

> *"To prepare for the eventual reconstruction of German political life on a democratic basis. . . . All democratic political parties with rights of assembly and of public discussion shall be allowed and encouraged. . . ."*

The Adenauer regime in 1956 banned the German Communist Party, the staunchest opposition in the fight against German rearmament as it had been against Hitler. In addition, a total of over 200 democratic organisations have been banned by the Federal Government, and hundreds of people jailed.

A grim picture? Yes, and a grim reality.

The German Democratic Republic

"War is the national industry of Prussia," said Mirabeau 180 years ago. But where the Prussian Junker once flourished there flourishes today the German Democratic Republic—and that is one of the industries they did not nationalise. In fact, one of the earliest laws in East Germany was one making war propaganda a punishable offence. The Junker landowning class got the boot, the land was divided among the peasants, all large and most medium-size industry was nationalised and today the German Democratic Republic is fast building Socialism, with leading people in every sphere drawn mainly from the working class, from known anti-fascists.

Starting, when faced by the Western powers with the economic division of Germany, with a highly unbalanced economy, the German Democratic Republic is now fast catching up West German production and consumption standards and hopes to equal it in production per head within the next two or three years.

When West Germany became one of the principal N.A.T.O. countries, the German Democratic Republic joined the Socialist countries' Warsaw Pact.

In yet another important respect the German Democratic Republic differs from West Germany. East Germany, where the basic principles of the Potsdam Declaration have been carried out, has also recognised and accepted the Oder-Neisse eastern frontier which was agreed at Potsdam.

Adamant Adenauer, however, as recently as February once again asserted that West Germany does not recognise that frontier. West Germany is also the only country concerned in the Rapacki Plan for a nuclear free area in Central Europe which has completely rejected the plan.

"Free" Elections Propaganda

For the past ten years all Soviet attempts to get a German peace treaty discussed were met with the same circular argument by the Western powers over and over again. No discussion of Germany without discussion of German reunification; no reunification except on the basis of so-called "free elections in the whole of Germany; and no reunified Germany unless it was "free" to belong to the N.A.T.O. pact. That was the Western posture, kept unchanged year after year at Chancellor Adenaeur's insistence with the backing of Mr. Dulles.

The fraud of "free" elections has worn somewhat thin. From the start it meant freedom for one force only: freedom for the German monopolists and the former Hitler generals who want to reunite Germany as an aggressive military N.A.T.O. power ready to unleash war against the Socialist countries. For what "freedom" would there have been in elections while occupation troops are still in position, while many democratic organisations in West Germany are banned, many patriots in prison?

Knowing from the outset that this was a totally unacceptable proposition the Western powers used it also to snag up other East-West negotations. Progress in disarmament was blocked partly by insisting that progress on the German question would have to be part of a disarmament agreement—and progress on the German question only on the Western formula.

Had the Western "proposal" been put into practice, it would have been in direct negation of the Potsdam provisions, pushing aggressive N.A.T.O.'s frontiers 300 miles east. Further, since the Western powers had split Germany, they could not expect agreement on a settlement which was not based on recognition of the two States of Germany, could not expect the German Democratic Republic to allow its Socialist achievements to be handed back to the expropriated Junkers and industrialists.

All this, while the Western powers and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adenauer were using West Berlin as an ideally situated spring-board to hamper East Germany's development as far as possible, and even to send spies and agents into other People's Democracies. Some sixty-two West German and American and other Western secret-service type organisations have headquarters in West Berlin. Another 339 similar organisations with headquarters in West Germany use Berlin as a gateway east.

The presence of British, American and French troops right in the middle of the German Democratic Republic carries with it the constant danger of an incident arising which could set off a conflagration.

So the Soviet Union last November announced that it would hand over its remaining functions in Berlin to the German Democratic Republic within six months, and suggested to the Western powers that West Berlin should be made a demilitarised free city under United Nations guarantee. Then on January 10th the Soviet Union once again proposed that it was time to consider a German peace treaty, and submitted a draft which, in the conditions of 1959, embodies the principles agreed among the Allies in 1945. This draft leaves the question of German reunification to the two German States to discuss with each other; it bars Germany from having or making nuclear weapons or guided missiles; and provides for all foreign troops to leave Germany within a year of the treaty being signed.

The German Democratic Republic had for two years previously been urging West Germany to agree to discuss the formation of a German confederation.

Mr. Khrushchov has since made it clear that the six months deadline of the Berlin changes can be extended beyond May 27th if there are real East-West negotiations, and during his Berlin visit last month he discussed with the German Democratic Republic Government the peace treaty which, if the West refuse to discuss and sign one, the Soviet Union will sign with the German Democratic Republic.

The response to all these Soviet moves from the N.A.T.O. camp was twofold. There has been the usual crop of belligerent outbursts, particularly on the Berlin question. "On the basic proposition of standing firm in Berlin, and if need be, risking a war rather than being taken out of Berlin, upon that there is complete agreement," declared Mr. Dulles shortly before withdrawing to hospital. " Total war," advocated Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, the American military strategist. And President Eisenhower, on March 11th, in Press conference references which left his listeners more than usually confused, ruled out a ground war over Berlin but threatened American use of nuclear weapons.

The danger of such warlike attitudes must not be under-estimated in this era of push-button warfare, particularly when the concept of preventive war is being raised again in America under the guise of "pre-emptive" war.

> "It is now becoming clear that the United States does not intend to sit by and take the 'first blow' but will strike whenever it becomes apparent that an enemy is actually preparing to strike at us,"

wrote Washington commentator David Lawrence in the *New York Herald Tribune* on March 10th —the day before the President's threat to use nuclear weapons over Berlin. The trouble with "pre-emptive" war is that after you have dropped your pre-emptive nuclear bombs and rockets, you cannot say: "Sorry, old boy. My mistake. I thought you were going to attack me."

This means danger for Britain, too, for the Soviet Union has made it plain that the unleashing of nuclear war will mean instant retaliation against American rocket bases.

In the four months since the Soviet Union raised the Berlin and German peace treaty questions, however, there have also been significant moves towards a cold war thaw. From the Mikoyan visit to the U.S. to the Macmillan visit to Moscow runs one important thread: "The main point is that on these wider problems we reached agreement that the great issues which separate East and West must be settled by negotiation," Mr. Macmillan told the Commons on March 4th on returning from Russia.

The public acknowledgment of that piece of common-sense—which the Soviet Union has been stressing for years—earned Mr. Macmillan cold welcomes in Paris, Bonn and Washington on his round of capitals last month. And yet it was realised in most of the chancelleries of the N.A.T.O. powers that the old formulas could not just be dished up again.

By trying to widen the agenda of East-West talks to include also German reunification—which only the two German States are now really qualified to discuss—the Western powers, however, prepared at least one ready-made obstacle to pull out later. Mr. Macmillan also found de Gaulle and Adenauer particularly bitter with the suspicion that he had agreed with Mr. Khrushchov to discuss disengagement. The Premiers had agreed in the Moscow communique that

> "further study could usefully be made of the possibilities of increasing security by some method of limitation of forces and weapons,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both conventional and nuclear, in an agreed area of Europe, coupled with an appropriate system of inspection."

In the N.A.T.O. capitals Mr. Macmillan hastened to say that "the British are not disengagers", but that what he was thinking of was more along the lines of the Eden plan of 1955 for inspection and limitation of forces in an agreed area—which could take place without very much reduction by the Western powers, or even none, it was hinted by British official circles.

Moreover, the Eden plan of the Geneva Summit meeting in 1945, had been changed by the time of the autumn 1955 Foreign Ministers' meeting, to make the central border of the East-West area to be covered the eastern frontier of the German Democratic Republic, instead of the border between East and West Germany as originally put forward.

Still, Mr. Macmillan's desire for some form of East-West talks was evidently too strong for some of his N.A.T.O. partners. The lack of absolute identity of interests between Mr. Macmillan and Chancellor Adenauer—with West German military and economic hegemony developing over West Europe—partly accounts for that difference.

Even if Mr. Macmillan cannot say too much about British capitalists' doubts about the West Germans, others have done so for him. Mr. G. Pollock, director of the British Employers' Confederation, speaking at a London luncheon on February 19th, stressed the danger of competition for British industry from a united Germany freed from expenditure on nuclear weapons.

That Mr. Macmillan's electoral considerations also play a considerable part is obvious. It can also be a useful part—if the pressure of the British people ensures that the Premier keeps on until something tangible comes out of East-West talks so that a step is made at last towards peaceful co-existence.

That is where the Labour Party has all these months been missing such a vital dual opportunity: to put pressure on the Government for a peace policy while gaining support through this for the coming elections.

Last December 4th, a few days after the Soviet proposal on Berlin, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, Foreign Secretary, in a Commons debate repeated the old formula for Germany—free elections, free to join N.A.T.O.—and turned down the Soviet Berlin suggestions. Mr. Bevan, Labour Shadow Foreign Secretary, who followed him, pointed out that Mr. Lloyd's formula was "not a recipe for anything other than the continued disunity of Germany". But while urging that the Government should take up the Labour Party disengagement scheme, even while stressing that the Berlin situation was "anomalous", and "so inflammable that anything might happen there", Mr. Bevan joined Mr. Lloyd in saying that the Berlin proposals were "unacceptable". A month later the Labour Party issued a statement telling the Government it should not have simply said "No" on Berlin, but should have suggested negotiations on the Rapacki Plan.

The Government had meanwhile followed Mr. Dulles in hinting that maybe East German officials dealing with transport to Berlin could be recognised "as Soviet agents", and, later, that "free elections" were not necessarily the only way to German reunification—though still the best in the view of both Governments.

The Labour Party's policy on it all, apart from the Gaitskell plan, was getting more and more indistinguishable from the Tories. Then forty-eight Labour backbenchers tabled a motion demanding recognition of the German Democratic Republic, talks between the two Germanys, to form "an all-German Federal Council with which a treaty of peace could be negotiated".

Here at last was the basis on which Labour could have gained nation-wide support and enthusiasm. But the Right Wing "statesmen" stepped in with an amendment simply going back to the Western powers' circular formula.

The outcome was a compromise motion simply restating the Gaitskell plan, which by providing for Western withdrawals from West Germany only, while Soviet troops leave all Eastern Europe, in effect would wind up the Warsaw Pact though leaving N.A.T.O. intact.

But the question does not rest there.

It is acknowledged at last that there must be negotiations—as millions of people in Britain and throughout the world have demanded for years. Now the Labour movement must insist that fruitful Summit talks start at the earliest possible moment, in order to reach agreement on a German peace treaty on the basis of Germany belonging to neither N.A.T.O. nor the Warsaw Pact; the reunification of Germany being left to the two German States to discuss peacefully—the existing German States or a reunified Germany being banned from having nuclear weapons. Agreement should also be reached on the establishment of a zone of disengagement on the lines of the revised Rapacki Plan; on the withdrawal from Germany and other European States of all foreign troops, British, French, American and Soviet; leading to the final burial of the cold war by the winding up of N.A.T.O. and the Warsaw Pact.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Basic problems of the Indonesian revolution

D. N. Aidit

(*Speech delivered on January 11th, 1959, at the Indonesian People's University*)

ONE of the subjects to be taught in the Political and Social Sciences Course at our People's University is the "Indonesian Independence Movement". This is a *political* subject aimed in the first place at clarifying all the basic and important problems of the Revolution, that is, the basic strategic problems and the tactical problems of the Indonesian Revolution in accordance with the standpoint, outlook and method of Marxism-Leninism, according to the teachings of Lenin concerning the Revolution in colonial countries.

As an introduction to this political subject, I think that it is necessary to begin with a general outline.

Why do we have the People's University as well as other forms of education which, to a lesser or greater extent, have the same objective as the People's University? Why do you, both Communists and non-Communists, want to study at the People's University? And yet, the People's University provides no guarantee that you will obtain better employment or earnings as a result of completing studies here. What is this all for, then? I think that I am not making a mistake if I say that we are doing all this because we are all firmly resolved to serve the Indonesian Revolution better. There is no more glorious aim in study, whatever it may be that is being studied, than to improve our services to the revolution.

In the People's University, the students will study the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the standpoint, outlook and method of Marxism-Leninism under the subjects of Marxist Political Economics and the Indonesian Independence Movement. To make the course complete, students following the social and political sciences course will also study Indonesian history and world history as well as Indonesia's social and economic structure, Indonesian and world geography, law and so on. The aim of all this is to serve the Indonesian Revolution better. This means that the target of our study is the Indonesian Revolution.

This, Comrades, is what I want to stress on this occasion; study with a target, that target being the Indonesian Revolution. If we study and work well, or in other words, if we master Marxism-Leninism and are able in practice to apply the standpoint, outlook and method of Marxism-Leninism, we shall certainly achieve our target and the Indonesian Revolution will be victorious in the not too distant future.

You are all certainly aware of the fact that Marxism came to Indonesia for the first time in 1914, that is with the establishment of the I.S.D.V. (the Indische Sociaal Democratische Vereniging). From that time, Marxism began to be welded together with the revolutionary activities of the masses of the working people; it was studied by a small number of Indonesian intellectuals and Dutch intellectuals who took part in the revolutionary movement of the Indonesian people.

With the establishment of the C.P.I. in 1920 under the strong influence of the victory of the Russian October Revolution in 1917, the process of welding Marxism-Leninism with the practice of the Indonesian Revolution, with the revolutionary activities of the masses of the Indonesian people, entered a new, decisive phase. Ever since then, Marxism-Leninism has become inseparable from the mass movement of the Indonesian people. Counter-revolutionary colonial and national hurricanes were quite unable to separate Marxism-Leninism from the mass movement of the Indonesian people.

If we, today, recall the period of the 1920's, and even if we recall the entire period up to 1951, we will realise just how shallow the Communists' knowledge of Marxism-Leninism was at that time. This is why we should not be surprised if, during the period prior to 1951, the welding of Marxism-Leninism with the practice of the Indonesian Revolution did not proceed well and rapidly, and some serious mistakes were committed in leading the Indonesian Revolution.

But it was due to the fact that Marxism-Leninism has entered into the Indonesian Independence Movement, that these serious mistakes and failures did not weaken and certainly did not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

destroy the revolutionary movement of the Indonesian people. Marxism-Leninism helps the working class to analyse and draw the conclusions from mistakes and failures, and in this way raise the struggle of the Indonesian people to a higher level.

It is thanks to the struggle and sacrifices of the best of Indonesia's sons and daughters in an effort to seek the truth in this twentieth century so as to save our Motherland and people, that conditions are different today from what they were in the 1920's. Our knowledge of Marxism-Leninism is quite considerable, quite deep and is beginning to involve many different aspects. The general line of the C.P.I. is already correct and is no longer a problem. The membership of the C.P.I. is already about 1,500,000 and almost all of them play an active part in, or occupy positions of leadership in, the people's movement. The C.P.I.'s work in preserving national independence, defending democracy and world peace has achieved certain successes, too. All these are favourable phenomena and should be welcomed by all revolutionaries. Thus, what has to be done now to improve revolutionary work so that the Indonesian Revolution can more speedily achieve victory?

In my opinion, there are still serious weaknesses which must be overcome by the C.P.I. and by all persons who genuinely want the Indonesian Revolution to achieve its objective in the not too distant future. What I am referring to here is that the Communists and their sympathisers must change their method of studying.

Communists must Study

There is no question any more about the fact that Communists must study. Ever since the C.P.I. was formed, its leaders have studied diligently and many courses have been run for C.P.I. cadres and members. During the 1945-48 People's Revolution, the Central Committee of the C.P.I. succeeded in setting up a *Marx House,* and lower Committees organised many courses. No one can deny that the C.P.I. is a Party whose cadres and members study hard. This ability to study hard has in general been possessed by C.P.I. members up to the present time. This is a good phenomenon.

But there have been bad things in the past, and they still exist today among certain C.P.I. members, and that is carrying out study that is in contradiction with Marxism-Leninism because the study of theory is separated from revolutionary practice. Students in the past were not educated to weigh up the practice of the Indonesian Revolution from the point of view of theory. Revolutionary theory and practice at that time were like two wheels of a bicycle rotating in different directions. It is, of course, impossible to make any progress like that, is it not? At that time, teachers did not strive to link up the study of theory with the practice of the revolution. They talked about "linking up" theory with practice; they said that "theory without practice is powerless" but they did not act in accordance with their statements about "linking up" theory and practice. The teachers at that time were merely translators of books and the students were educated to become the echoes of the teachers. The teachers did not strive to present problems and their solution from the Marxist-Leninist point of view. Thus the students were not educated to solve concrete problems. At that time, and it still happens today, Marxism-Leninism was studied by a method directly in conflict with Marxism-Leninism, in violation of a basic principle of Marxism-Leninism, the principle of the *unity* of theory and practice. Unconsciously, the opposite principle was being applied, namely the *separation* of theory and practice.

In the past, Schools and Courses which were run also taught political economy but not with the purpose of helping the students to understand the conditions of Indonesia's economy with its various peculiarities. Teachers who taught political science spoke about the experiences of various revolutions in foreign countries but did not speak about the strategy and tactics of the Indonesian Revolution itself. Philosophy was also taught in the Party Schools and Courses in the time before 1951, but only in order to know a little something about it, and the teachers did not get the students to study the logics of the Indonesian Revolution. The result was that the situation did not undergo any change; those who completed courses at Party Schools did not become any cleverer and in fact not a few of them became more stupid and more arrogant, because during the time they had been at the Party School they had been separated from revolutionary practice, whereas within the Party School, they had had dead formulas stuffed into them, and those who completed courses considered that they had become theoreticians. And yet, they were far from that, they were no more than like persons who had read one or two novels and yet had the audacity to call themselves writers. A person who has only read Marxist books cannot possibly be called a Marxist theoretician, just as a person who has read literary books cannot be called a writer.

In the past, the term "theoretician" was interpreted as meaning a person who has learnt a few revolutionary formulas by heart but who could not solve practical problems. The "theoretician" felt that his authority as a "theoretician" was raised even further, the more he was unable to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solve practical problems. Practical revolutionary teachings were frequently considered as being work for people who do not use their brains so much in the course of work. In brief, it was considered as being "coarse" work. We have in the past called such theoreticians "Marxist kiyais",* that is people whose work it is to "sell" Marxist postulates, regardless of whether these formulas are appropriate or not, regardless of whether they are useful or dangerous to any particular stage of the revolutionary struggle.

Since 1951, that is following the defeat of the 1926 Revolt, following the defeat of the People's Revolution of 1945-48, and following the bloody Madiun Provocation in 1948, the Communists made a review of what had happened, analysed the mistakes made in the past, drew conclusions about the past period and for future work. The leaders of the C.P.I. made a greater study of theory, they took part in revolutionary work and genuinely tried to solve the practical problems being faced by the Indonesian people. Efforts made within the leadership to master the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism were carried out earnestly, and the leadership began seriously to apply the standpoint, outlook and method of Marxism-Leninism in facing the Indonesian Revolution. Since that time a serious effort has been made to work on the basis of conditions in Indonesia itself. Gradually, economic, political, social and cultural conditions in Indonesia have been studied and on the basis of this knowledge of Indonesian society it has been determined what the basic problems of the Indonesian Revolution are, such as the question of the targets and tasks of the Indonesian Revolution, the driving force of the Indonesian Revolution, the nature and perspectives of the Indonesian Revolution.

Aims of the Indonesian Revolution

Today everyone right from the highest official, members of the Legislative Assemblies down to school children, speaks about the "national revolution" and about "completing the August 1945 Revolution". But how many of these people who speak about the Indonesian Revolution have made an investigation of Indonesian society in which this revolution is taking place, so as to be able to decide what are the *targets*, the *tasks*, the *driving force*, the *nature* and the *perspectives* of the Indonesian Revolution? Or, how many of those who want to "complete the Indonesian Revolution" know what has to be completed?

Many people like to talk about "completing the Indonesian Revolution", but it is not clear what has to be completed, or, each person has his own interpretation. For some people "the Revolution is completed" when they own a commercial enterprise and earn big profits. For others it is when they become minister or ambassador or a high government official or a general, and so on. The conscious working class and working people naturally have a different understanding of what is meant by completing the Indonesian Revolution. This is why it is very urgent to achieve a unified understanding among the Indonesian people about what is meant by "completing the August 1945 Revolution". Only in this way shall we be able to take revolutionary steps that are correct and more resolute.

It is an indispensable condition if we are to decide upon the basic problems of the Indonesian Revolution, to have a thorough and exact knowledge of Indonesian society today. This of course does not apply to people who indeed deliberately oppose the Indonesian Revolution. But for all Indonesian sons and daughters inspired with feelings of good will towards the people, a knowledge of Indonesian society is indispensable if they are more consciously to go on taking part in the Indonesian Revolution.

We often say that Indonesia is already independent. If we don't include West Irian, this is indeed true. No one can say that Indonesia is still a colonised country. But how far does our independence go? Is our independence at the same stage as, for example, the independence of Malaya, India, the U.S.A., Britain, the Soviet Union, People's China, and so on. Are we politically really independent? Are we economically independent? How about our national culture in present-day independent Indonesia? Are we indeed free to build our national culture? Are we completely free to decide upon everything in accordance with our own wishes? There may possibly be some people who say: why make the question of independence an academic problem, why make a question of what is the stage of our independence?

To raise the question of how far our independence goes today is in no sense making an academic question of it; this is a very practical question, a question of everyday need to determine the practical steps to be taken in our revolutionary work. From the answers to the above questions we shall be able to decide what the basic problems of our revolution are, the question of the basic strategy and tactics of the revolution.

Thus, it is a task of the political teachers at the "People's University" to deal with the situation of Indonesian society today, to deal with the question of whether Indonesia is today a country

* a 'kiyai' is a person whose duty it is to learn the Koran off by heart for repetition at religious ceremonies.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is completely independent or whether it is still a semi-colonial country. Of whether Indonesian society is capitalist or semi-capitalist. Of whether feudalism is still fully in force in Indonesia or whether it is only the survivals that remain, and whether these survivals are heavy or light. All this must be taken up by the political teachers at the People's University. They must also take up the question of the influence of imperialism and feudalism on Indonesian politics and culture today.

Only by investigating well the conditions of Indonesian society today will the political teachers be able to present their thoughts about the Indonesian Revolution well. The Indonesian Revolution is not something which has fallen from the skies or grown out of the ground; it has been born out of the womb of Indonesian society itself. This is why it is not possible for someone to talk about the Indonesian Revolution if he does not first undertake an investigation into Indonesian society today.

In the cause of the greatness of the Indonesian Revolution, we may and must study revolutions in other countries. This is why the students at the People's University must also study world history, with the emphasis upon studying the important revolutions of the world, such as the American Revolution, the French Revolution, etc. And especially, it is very important to study the revolutions of the twentieth century such as the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917, the Chinese Revolution, etc. But studying all this does not free us from the need to study the Indonesian Revolution itself. Or, it would be more correct to say that we study the revolutions in other countries with the aim of understanding our own revolution better, and in order to discover the path that is most appropriate for our revolution.

An Indonesian cannot possibly become a conscious revolutionary if he, for example, does not understand the essence of the national awakening that started in 1908, the essence of the "Islam Union" established in 1912, the essence of the C.P.I. founded in 1920, the essence of the 1926-7 Revolt, the essence of the P.N.I. established in 1927, the essence of the "Youth Pledge" of 1928 and the essence of the August 1945 Revolution.

In order to become an Indonesian revolutionary, a person may and indeed must read books written by people of other countries, but he cannot possibly become a conscious revolutionary in present-day conditions without studying and understanding the writing of the leading personalities of the Indonesian Revolution, such as, for example, Ing. Sukarno's (today, the President of the Republic of Indonesia) books *Achieving an Independent Indonesia* and *Indonesia Accuses.*

The material gathered together by the C.C. of the C.P.I. on the economic history of Indonesia, on its political history and its cultural history, together with the material on the economic, political and cultural conditions in Indonesia today, will greatly assist the political teachers at the "People's University" to call upon the students to study actual conditions in Indonesian society today. It is only with the knowledge obtained from the results of the investigations and study of Indonesian society that we shall be able to decide what we must do to push the Indonesian Revolution forward, and further, to "complete the Indonesian Revolution".

From the study of Indonesian society today, the students will know that in our country today, there is a double form of oppression, the oppression of imperialism and of feudalism which has resulted in the broad masses of the Indonesian people, and in particular the peasants, becoming more and more destitute, and in many of them becoming bankrupt, living in circumstances of starvation and half naked. The double oppression of imperialism and feudalism has resulted in the development of national industry and national culture being under a very great strain.

Imperialism and Feudalism

In studying the conditions of Indonesian society, the students will know that in modern Indonesian society today, the contradiction between imperialism and the Indonesian nation, and the contradiction between feudalism and the vast masses of the people, and in the first place the peasants, are basic contradictions. Of these two basic contradictions, the contradiction between imperialism and the Indonesian nation is the most basic, the one which has to be settled first.

Thus if we know that there is the double oppression of imperialism and feudalism in Indonesian society today, and that the basic contradictions in Indonesian society today are the contradictions between imperialism and the Indonesian nation and the contradiction between feudalism and the masses of the people, in the first place the peasants, then it will be clear for us that the *basic targets* or *basic enemies* of the Indonesian Revolution at the present stage are imperialism and feudalism. Thus, it is a big mistake if there are, for example, Communists who regard the Nationalists or the national bourgeoisie as the target of the Indonesian Revolution, just as it is a mistake, too, if there are Nationalists or patriotic religious leaders who regard the Communists and the working class as the enemy of the Indonesian Revolution.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Once the basic targets of the Indonesian Revolution are clear, and so long as the people's leaders, Communist and non-Communist alike, hold firmly to this, it will be possible to avoid unnecessary contradictions among the people, national unity will become stronger, and the blows aimed at the real enemies will be much heavier. This means speeding up, achieving "the completion of the Indonesian Revolution".

According to the experiences of the revolutionary movement from the beginning of the present century up to the present day, much revolutionary energy has been wasted as a result of the sharpening of conflicts between the people which were in actual fact not necessary at all, and this has greatly obstructed the progress of the Indonesian Revolution. Revolutionary leaders with a feeling of great responsibility towards the Motherland and people always strive to settle the minor contradictions among the people in the best possible way, and to prevent them from becoming major contradictions which would mean relieving to a lesser or greater extent the enemies of the people, imperialism and feudalism, of the blows of the revolutionary movement. To increase the contradictions between the people, whether directly or indirectly, means helping the enemies of the people. The people will not like anyone who splits the unity of the people because such actions are the habit of the imperialists.

After we know that there are two basic forms of oppression in Indonesian society today, that is, imperialism and feudalism, it will become clear that the most important tasks of the Indonesian Revolution are to carry out the national revolution, to throw out imperialism, the enemy from without, and to carry out the democratic revolution for the elimination of feudal landlords. The peasants can only be aroused to oppose imperialism if they are also helped in their struggle against feudalism.

Thus it is a very great mistake for people to think that the task of the Indonesian Revolution today is to liquidate or prevent the development of national industrialists and businessmen, or to put an end to land ownership by middle peasants and rich peasants. It is also a great mistake for people to think that the task of the Indonesian Revolution is to hold back the workers' movement, to hold back the peasants' movement and to hold back the Communist movement. All such things, if they happened, would obstruct the advance of the Indonesian Revolution, would delay the liquidation of imperialism and feudalism in Indonesia; these things would not only mean going against the tide now flowing in Indonesian society, but would also mean helping the enemies of the Indonesian Revolution. Holding back the Indonesian workers' movement and the Indonesian peasants' movement means holding back the Indonesian Communist movement, and holding back the Indonesian Communist movement means holding back the Indonesian workers' movement and the Indonesian peasants' movement. Such things are the same as what the reactionaries do; they remind the Indonesian people of the practices of the Dutch colonialists, the Japanese militarists and the domestic reactionaries.

Unity of the Revolutionary Forces

After we know that the targets of the Indonesian Revolution at the present stage are imperialism and feudalism, and that the tasks of the Indonesian Revolution are to throw imperialism out and eliminate the feudal landlords, then we must gather together the forces in society that are consistently anti-imperialist and anti-feudal, or in other words gather together the *driving forces* or the moving forces of the Indonesian Revolution. These driving forces include the working class, the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and other democratic elements that are harmed by imperialism and that consistently oppose imperialism. The driving forces of the Indonesian Revolution at the present stage are what we call the progressive forces, that is the forces that objectively are on the side of the revolution and whose consistency in this has already been proven. The progressive forces not only agree to the liquidation of imperialism and feudalism in Indonesia, but also agree to and are struggling for a socialist society.

But our duty is not only to draw in the progressive forces that are the driving forces of the revolution, but also we must strive to draw in the middle-of-the-road forces, that is to draw in the national bourgeoisie, who, even though vacillating by nature, are also anti-imperialist and anti-feudal. They are vacillating because, besides having contradictions with the imperialists and landlords, they also have contradictions with the workers and other working people.

In order to achieve the objective of the Indonesian Revolution which is national and democratic in character, the most important tactic is to unite the progressive forces with the middle-of-the-road forces, and this means uniting the entire forces of the Indonesian people. The work of uniting the entire people, that is the workers, and peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie; this is what we call building the national front. Since the majority of the Indonesian people consists of the peasants and the workers, it is not possible to have a strong national front if it is not based on an alliance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the working class and the peasants, and if it is not led by the most advanced and most consistent of the oppressed classes, that is, the working class.

Nature of Indonesia's Revolution

After we know that there is the double oppression of imperialism and feudalism in Indonesian society, and after we know that the targets of the Indonesian Revolution are imperialism and feudalism, that the tasks of the Indonesian Revolution are to overthrow imperialism and feudalism, and that it is our duty not only to build the progressive forces but also to draw in the national bourgeoisie, we can then come to a decision that the *nature* of our revolution at the present stage is not a socialist proletarian revolution but a national-democratic or a bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Persons who do not know Indonesian society, and who therefore cannot possibly know the Indonesian Revolution, are fond of proclaiming demagogically that we must carry out a socialist revolution right away, that we must liquidate national capitalism right away. These may indeed be well intentioned people who want the Indonesian Revolution to proceed rapidly, but there is no doubt that they are pursuing a policy that is not based on actual conditions in Indonesian society, they are thinking and acting subjectively, following their own whims without taking into account the conditions of society. But apart from this, there are also people who proclaim the need for a "socialist revolution now", whose deliberate aim it is to disrupt the revolution, who want to make the revolution proceed haltingly so as to delay it in attaining its objective. Such demagogy is very dangerous and can have very bad consequences for the revolutionary movement. The consequence is, among other things, the emergence of fear among the national bourgeoisie with the result that they become hostile to the revolution, or become more hostile than they were previously. As a result of such criminal demagogy, the reactionaries endeavour to divert the blows aimed by the revolution so as not to hit imperialism and the landlords. With their "socialist revolution now" demagogy, the reactionaries are giving rise to splits within the forces of the people, they are weakening the national front and are striving to save the imperialists and the landlords. This cannot mean anything other than strengthening the enemy. With these "left" slogans, these demagogues are striking against the genuine left-wingers.

Bearing in mind the fact that Indonesia's economy is still backward, that is, a semi-feudal agrarian economy that is greatly dependent upon the foreign market, the Indonesian Revolution at the present stage cannot possibly be proletarian-socialist in nature. It is not only that the Indonesian Revolution at the present stage does not have the task of liquidating individual ownership of those means of production that are in the hands of the Indonesian people; it must, moreover, preserve and provide means of production in the form of land free of charge to millions of peasants in an agrarian revolution. This makes clear the bourgeois character of the Indonesian Revolution at the present stage. The bourgeois character becomes even clearer from the fact that the Indonesian Revolution must help the patriotic national industrialists and businessmen. What the Indonesian Revolution must do at the present stage is to confiscate and nationalise the means of production that are in the hands of the big foreign capitalists. This makes clear the national character of the Indonesian Revolution.

In keeping with the nature of the Indonesian Revolution, which is not proletarian-socialist but national-democratic or bourgeois-democratic, the government which must be established in accordance with the demands of the Indonesian Revolution is not a government of the dictatorship of the proletariat but a government of the dictatorship of the people, or a People's Democratic Government. This government acts dictatorially towards the enemies of the people, that is the imperialists, the feudal landlords and other reactionaries, but it carries out the most democratic form of democracy among the people.

If we talk about the bourgeois-democratic nature of the Indonesian Revolution at the present stage, it is certainly not our intention to state that it is the same in nature as, for example, the French bourgeois revolution in 1789. The French Revolution in the eighteenth century took place in a world situation in which capitalism as a world system was in a period of growth. Since the Great October Socialist Revolution in 1917, the world has begun to move from capitalism to socialism, the world system of capitalism is in a state of general crisis. Ever since then, every revolution wherever it may take place, is certain to be harmful to the international capitalists, and objectively to strengthen socialism. Today, socialism is not only a system which is in power in one country but it has become a world system, about whose superiority over capitalism there is no longer any doubt. Thus, the Indonesian Revolution, too, viewed from the international struggle between capitalism and socialism, is detrimental to international capitalism and favourable to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world proletarian revolution. This is why the Indonesian Revolution at the present stage is not a democratic-bourgeois revolution of the old type but a bourgeois-democratic revolution of the new type.

The Socialist Future

Above, I have dealt briefly with the targets, the tasks, the driving force and the nature of the Indonesian Revolution as a result of investigations which have been guided by Marxist-Leninist theory and based upon the concrete circumstances in Indonesian society itself. From the above outline, it also becomes clear that the strategy of the Indonesian Revolution at the present stage is to complete the national and democratic revolution, or in popular language it can be expressed in the slogan, *"To complete the August* 1945 *Revolution in its entirety"*.

And now, the question will certainly arise; what are the perspectives or the future of the Indonesian Revolution, capitalism or socialism? Since the Indonesian Revolution, as has been stated above, is taking place in the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism, in the era of the general crisis of capitalism, and even more so in an era in which socialism has become a world system, added to which is the fact that the Indonesian people themselves already have a large Communist Party and revolutionary mass organisations, there can be no doubt about it that the future of the Indonesian Revolution is socialism and communism. There may be some people who do not like such a future, but this matter does not depend on persons who are dissolute and diehard. This is the law of the development of society, and the development to socialism and communism, supported by the working people of the entire world, not excluding the working people of Indonesia.

The times are with us in winning victory for the August 1945 Revolution completely, and in advancing towards socialism and communism. Become children of the time, faithful to its objective, socialism and communism.

The development of nations in South Africa

Lionel Forman

"SOUTH AFRICA belongs to all who live in it, black and white," the Freedom Charter declares. "Our country will never be prosperous or free until all our people live in brotherhood, enjoying equal rights and opportunities."

Only when this has been achieved will it be possible for a South African nation to develop. And before it does, the likelihood is that a number of different nations will come into being in our country, and that they will flower and prosper before they merge into one.

A single *African* nation in South Africa is likely to develop before a single *South African* nation does. And similarly it seems likely that *Zulu*, *Basotho* and other nations will develop before they merge into a single African nation in South Africa.*

* There may, of course, be substantial changes to the present state boundaries, which were drawn arbitrarily by the imperialist powers. The "South Africa" of the future may be a smaller or a larger place. This does not affect the argument. The peoples who today live together in our country are likely one day to merge into a single nation.

The Africans will constitute the main element in the future South African nation and we therefore begin with a study of the origins of African nationalism.

They are comparatively recent. The development of a single *African* political consciousness in South Africa only really begins in the 1880's. Until the nineteenth century the economic basis did not exist for the amalgamation of the numerous African tribes into states. They were cattle-grazers and small-scale farmers, and as they required large areas of pasture and lived at subsistence level the tendency was towards dispersal rather than concentration of population. Even when, with the accumulation of wealth, a ruling class and a state developed, it was capable of exercising its authority only over a limited area, and when conflicts of interest arose it was powerless to prevent dissident tribal groups within the tribe from moving off to pastures new.

As new techniques were acquired, making possible a greater division of labour and the development of a standing army, groups of African tribes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have developed towards a statehood and unification just as people did in Europe, and this is clearly demonstrated early in the nineteenth century by the Zulus from the time of Tshaka, and the Basotho from that of Moshoeshoe.

Unification in this form, however, was smashed in its infancy by British imperialism.

Nevertheless, it is not impossible that, taking the long view, British imperialism hastened the development of a single African nation rather than retarded it. The huge inflow of capital which came with the discovery of diamonds in 1870, and of gold sixteen years later, transformed South Africa from a collection of primitive pastoral and agricultural communities into a single economic unit, and smashed the tribal system and sped up the process of unification of the Africans.

Long before the industrial revolution wrought by the discovery of diamonds and the imperialist intervention in South Africa, the voluntary amalgamation of all the black people to make a stand against the white advance had been a dream of the most farsighted African leaders and the nightmare of all the Europeans. But it had remained a dream.

Far from there being unity of the African tribes, a handful of Europeans were able to exploit inter-tribal conflicts so skilfully that in every decisive campaign by far the main burden of fighting, on the European side, was borne by Africans.

At the diamond fields men were transformed from Zulu, Xosa or Basotho tribesmen into African workers. Members of a myriad of separate tribes came, for the first time, to see themselves as a single brotherhood united by their common economic interest. Theirs was not a working-class consciousness, but an African working class consciousness, for they were subject to political disabilities on the ground of race, which, by giving the lowliest white worker the status of boss over all black men, almost completely obscured any common interest between white and black workers.

Though handicapped by the absence of a common language—the *lingua franca* was Dutch—the black workers were not slow in evolving the weapon of workers' unity. There was an African strike at Kimberley in 1882, before there is any record of a strike by European workers in South Africa.

At the same time a tiny African petit bourgeoisie, composed of mission assistants, priests, teachers and clerks, was coming into existence in the Eastern Cape, and in the early 1880's the first bodies cutting across tribal barriers, the first *African* bodies, came into being. Most important of these were mutual benefit societies at Kimberley (embryo trade unions), the African Educational Association (composed of teachers and priests around the mission stations of the Eastern Cape) and the general political organisation, Imbumba Yama Afrika.

The Imbumba was the counterpart of the Afrikander Bond (which incidentally coined the phrase "Africa for the Africans", meaning by that Afrikaners) and it may be described as the first non-European national organisation—the direct forerunner of the African National Congress. Like the Afrikander Bond, it came into being as the result of the heightened national oppression which followed the decision of the British government, in 1874, to establish complete control over Southern Africa.

From the formation of Imbumba onwards, the drive towards the unity of all Africans continued steadily. By the time of Union there were political organisations uniting men not as members of tribes but as Africans (though the word "African" was not yet used) in each of the provinces, and with Union their merger into the South African Native National Congress was a natural development, the description "Congress" probably coming from the Indian Congress, via the Natal Indian Congress.

With Congress came the conscious assertion of a single African nationhood. The tribes had long been described as nations. Now the word nation came into common use both as a description of the individual tribes and for the African people as a whole.

Strictly speaking, the use of the word "nation" is inaccurate in both cases. Socialists define a "nation" in clear terms. If a community does not share a common language, territory, economy and culture, it is not a nation.

The everyday use of the word, however, is at variance with the scientific usage. Progressives use definitions as tools, not as straitjackets, and it would be pedantic to make any issue about the everyday use of the word—specially when we are not always quite sure what the correct word is.

But when it comes to serious theoretical analysis the situation is quite different. As Potekhin says: "It is by no means an argument about words. To give a definition of a 'nation' is of vital importance for the peoples. A nation is not an imaginary or mystical concept—it is a very real phenomenon, and as such needs an exact definition, without which it is impossible to understand the national question which plays such an important part in the life of the peoples of the present time" (Potekhin, Formation of Nations in Africa—*Marxism Today*—October 1958, p. 308).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Are There any Nations in South Africa?

It has long been recognised that it is possible to have a nation which does not have its own state. South Africa is an example of a state which has no nation.

A glance at the definition is sufficient to show that there is not a *South African* nation. The South African people have a variety of languages and cultures. For the same reason the *Africans* are not a nation.

What of the Zulus, Xosa, Basotho, Tswana, Swazi and Tsonga? What of the Afrikaners, English, Coloureds and Indians? Are they nations in South Africa?

No South Africans can vie with Verwoerd's Nationalists in the fervour with which they express the conviction not only that the Afrikaners are a nation, but that they are *the* nation.

But are they?

They have a common language and culture, certainly, but can it really be said that they have a common territory?

They inhabit the *same* territory, South Africa, in common with all other South Africans, black, white and brown, all inextricably mixed throughout the country. But there is no substantial territorial area where the Afrikaner is in the majority.

"Common territory" *must* mean a territory on one's own, because basic to the national question is that of self-determination and the right of secession. There is no part of South Africa which the Afrikaners could, by mere reason of their numbers, claim for the exercise of the right of secession. In *this* respect their position can be compared with that of the Jews in Russia, who, Stalin remarked in his argument showing that they do not constitute a nation, "are spread all over Russia and do not constitute a majority in a single Gubernia" (Stalin—*Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*).

A further essential to nationhood is a common economy, "in a word, a single national market" (Potekhin, *op. cit.*, p. 309). Just as is the position with regard to territory, so it is with the common economy whose existence is dependent on that of common territory. South Africa has a single national market—the Afrikaners have not. Nor (again like the Russian Jews) have they a normal class structure, which, as Stalin shows (*op cit.*, p. 36) is a factor to be considered in determining nationhood.

The ruling class has created a completely distorted class structure among the Africans. The great majority of them are peasant-migrant labourers and proletarians with only a tiny petit-bourgeoisie and an infinitesimal bourgeoisie. The complementary effect has been the distortion of the class structure of the Europeans. The white workers are essentially supervisors of African labour; there is an exceptionally big stratum of professional men and salaried officials. The Afrikaners are employed throughout the Government service, manning the enormous repressive apparatus, and with a working class well bribed and entirely petit-bourgeois in outlook.

For analogous reasons to the Afrikaners, the English, the Coloureds and Indians fail to qualify as nations.

When freedom is won, the Afrikaners and other national groups, if they so desire, will, no doubt, obtain the opportunity to develop into nations, being given the essential territorial basis for such development, as has happened in the U.S.S.R. and China.

The African "Pre-Nations"

The African communities are in a different position. Let us consider the Zulus.

There is no doubt that they have a common territory in Natal, in a substantial portion of which they are an overwhelming majority of the population. Similarly they have a common language and culture. In one respect only have they not yet attained nationhood, and that is with regard to the development of a single Zulu market. The government has strangled Zulu economic development because it is in the interests of the ruling class that the Zulus be kept at the level of unskilled labourers.

There is no doubt, however, that this stifling of the Zulu nation will not endure, and that the Zulus are on the threshold of true nationhood.

The Russian term for this type of community is "narodnost" (Potekhin, *op cit.*, p. 30). The closest English translation is "nationality", and as that has a different connotation in ordinary speech I would suggest that we use the word "pre-nation".

Other "pre-nations" in a position similar to the Zulus are the Basotho, the Xosas, the Swazis, the Tswana, etc.

Self-Determination

The position of the pre-nations is also different from that of the Afrikaners and the English—who have no territory of their own—when it comes to a consideration of the right to self-determination.

Progressives might, in certain circumstances, accord to a pre-nation the right to self-determination. In fact that is already our policy with regard to Basutoland where we recognise the democratic right of the Basutho to decide for themselves how best they can march towards nationhood.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although in Europe the demand for self-determination in some form was a characteristic feature of the national struggle, this is not the case in South Africa.

What is the reason for this?

In the first place the national oppression has quite a different basis from that of Europe before the First World War.

The national oppression here has not the primary purpose of keeping the bourgeoisie of the oppressed people out of the market place as it did in Europe (see Stalin, *op cit.*, p. 15). The oppressive laws here have the purpose, first and foremost, of driving the African *workers* to the factories and farms. The restrictions on the non-European bourgeoisie, crushing as they are, are quite secondary to the legal enslavement of the African workers, through the Pass Laws, the Master and Servant Acts, the industrial Colour Bar Acts, the complete ban on strikes and the Suppression of Communism Act.

Further the repression is not that of a dominant nation in one territory oppressing another in a different or adjacent territory. It is more that of a small minority, spread throughout a single country oppressing a big majority also spread out.

Whereas in Tsarist Russia, the Finns, Armenians, Georgians and the dozens of other peoples were separated, were oppressed in different ways and to different degrees, the Africans are in close contact and suffer identical oppression.

And thirdly the demand for self-determination is one which comes in the first place from the petit-bourgeoisie and in particular the traders, and this class is still infinitesimally small.

The demand of the people, therefore, is *not* for secession and self-determination in their own areas, but of full equality throughout the whole country. This is only a reflection of what we have already seen—that there are still no nations in South Africa.

The absence of a demand for self-determination does not mean that one should have no policy on the question. A quotation from Stalin (*op cit.*, pp. 202-203) is very apposite:

> "When in 1912 we Russian Marxists were drawing up the first draft of our national programme, no serious movement for national independence existed in any of the border regions of the Russian Empire. Nevertheless we deemed it necessary to include in our programme the point on the right of nations to self-determination, i.e. the right of every nationality to secede and exist as an independent state. Why did we do this?
>
> "Because we based ourselves not only on what then existed, but also on what was developing and impending in the general system of international relations; that is, we took into account not only the present, but also the future.
>
> "We knew that if any nationality were to demand secession we would fight to ensure the right to secede for every such nationality."

At the same time it is necessary to clear up a common misconception—that because they fight for the right of nations to self-determination, socialists favour the *exercise* of that right.

A large state enjoys obvious advantages over the small one and the world tendency is towards merger rather than to splitting up. Normally, no progressive would support any splitting up. He would oppose it. But the essence of socialism is that it is truly democratic. A nation has the democratic right even to follow a wrong path though socialists point the correct one. By analogy most people will agree that Mr. and Mrs. Smith should be *allowed* to have a divorce if they want one. That does not mean that they think that Mr. and Mrs. Smith *should* be divorced.

We should not ignore the existence of "pre-nations" and the likelihood that there will develop, when democracy is won, a brotherhood of different South African nations before a single South African nation emerges.

On the contrary, we should consider whether we are succeeding adequately today in identifying ourselves with the specific progressive national aspirations and ideas of the "pre-nations", just as we have completely identified ourselves with the demand that all share in common for the ending of apartheid and the achievement of democracy.

The dearest possessions of the "pre-nations" are their language, their culture and traditions.

It is obvious that to really get to the hearts and minds of the people, particularly the backward rural masses, it is necessary to develop to the full a presentation of our message which has its roots deep in the popular culture.

It is necessary to produce socialist literature in the language of the people—not merely in *translation* but in the original idiom. Because English is the most widely understood language it is natural that it should be so widely used for conferences and country-wide newspapers. But this is no excuse for neglecting the *majority* of the population who have not been fortunate enough to obtain sufficient education to read or to follow an argument in English. In this respect we could learn from Indian socialists who also use English as the international tongue, but at the same time produce extensive literature in the vernacular languages.

If there is any neglect of these people it is still a hang-over from the old days when there was a feeling that the intellectuals were the only im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portant people in Congress, and when, in turning their backs on tribalism, the intellectuals tended to turn their backs also on their language and culture.

The need to remedy this situation is already widely recognised. The effect of the deeply moving and inspiring African political songs and music which has been created in recent years is evidence enough of the importance of this type of development. Now what are required are plays and poems and dances of liberation which will inspire and teach people who know no English, and which will give them that added consciousness of dignity which pride in a national culture instils.

The cultural revolution, revisionism and the Party

V. Gomulka

(*Extracts from his Report to the Third Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party, March 10th, 1959.*)

THE cultural revolution is an indispensable element of a Socialist revolution. The process of the cultural revolution unfolds through the popularisation of advanced culture among the popular masses, and through the development of artistic and intellectual creation in the spirit of Socialism.

The trend of development of the cultural revolution is determined by making culture a part of the whole of the life of society and of the needs of social development. The masses cannot be indifferent to the question whether in the concrete historical and social situation the development of our culture helps society to free itself from the fetters of capitalism's past heritage or not; whether it helps or not to shape a new, Socialist consciousness, and thus promotes the building of Socialism itself.

The primary principle of our cultural policy, which results from the experience of the entire history of the modern working class movement, is to base cultural creativeness on a Marxist-Leninist world outlook and methodology.

During the last fourteen years our scientific and artistic creativeness, and our pedagogic, popularisation and didactic activities, have been steadily advancing in a Socialist direction, overcoming in ideological struggle diverse forms of resistance.

During the second five-year period of our independence dogmatic mistakes erupted on the surface of our cultural policy and in many ways restricted the initiative of artists and cultural workers.

Our Party has done away with these mistakes in a radical manner.

Our Cultural Policy

The present cultural policy ensures to artists all the possibilities for developing; it ensures material help from the State, and freedom to search for artistic expression without administrative interference in creative endeavour. Reflecting the opinion and the needs of the people, our Party fights by ideological means for an easily-understood art, which could be near and dear to the working people and expresses its Socialist aspirations.

We support in the first place a literature realistic in form, Socialist in content and in relation to the world, to man's destiny. Such a literature is considered by us worthy of the widest popularisation. We also support progressive artistic creation, broadening mental horizons, shaping moral character and aesthetic sense. We publish artistic works of old and contemporary authors though they are not based on Marxism but by their character serve the cause of man's liberation. We also recognise art which corresponds to other sound spiritual needs of man: the need of rest, cultural amusement, relaxation and the like.

The Party's role as guide in the fields of culture means that its Socialist ideals and scientific world outlook should inspire the spiritual and social essence of literary and artistic creativeness, and its policy should ensure the popularisation on a mass scale of the cultural goods which serve to increase the Socialist consciousness of the people, to broaden their cultural horizons, overcome obscurantism, superstition, the bourgeois and clerical heritage.

This was, and continues to be, the aim of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Central Committee of our Party when it set the course for the institutions and organs which represent the State's cultural policy.

The favourable realisation of the above-defined policy with regard to artistic creation depends also on its authors. No one can choose for them their place in the world which surrounds them, in our society which is building Socialism. They, and only they—writers and artists—can draw conclusions for their artistic work from such a choice, each within his capability and talent.

Why then have so many contemporary writers and other cultural creators wandered for a long time, lost at the ideological crossroads? Why have they lost their links with the leading Socialist forces of the nation? It is the result of their revisionist and bourgeois-liberal political tendencies.

A number of works of a harmful, idealist character have been written under the influence of these tendencies. Gloomy literature was born which proclaims despair and man's helplessness before evil, man's immanent cruelty and the futility of his social undertakings. Works were created which blacken Socialism and glorify its enemies. We refused and shall continue to refuse publication of such works, for they are not works of art but instruments of the anti-socialist forces' political propaganda. Our Party is alarmed by the fact that a section of our leading workers in the Union of Polish Writers fights under the slogan of defending "creative liberty" for freedom to publish such works. And if this harmful activity exerts a definite influence on the attitude of artistic circles, it is pre-eminently because many Party members and many left-wing writers and cultural workers have not shown proper consistency in combating the revisionist ideology of sterile negation. On the other hand, many of them evade taking an active part in defending the Party's ideological standpoint, and concentrate their attention only on the mistakes of our former policy. They treat lightly the chief opponents—which continue to be the influence of bourgeois ideology and the still considerable areas of obscurantism and backwardness.

Revisionists accuse us of wanting art which glosses over our reality. There is nothing more fallacious. We want an art that tells the truth about life, that portrays in an artistic form the difficult processes by which man is changed through the new social relations under Socialism. With every day of its existence Socialism proves its economic, social and moral superiority over capitalism. The truth about Socialism is sufficiently optimistic in itself. One must but look at reality through the eyes of the leading forces of the nation, and not through the spectacles of snobs and bourgeois critics of Socialism.

The Party's chief task on the cultural front at the present moment is to struggle for the total elimination of the influence of anti-Socialist and revisionist tendencies in creative circles, since these tendencies, in the conditions of the Party's correct cultural policy, constitute today the chief obstacle to the Socialist development of Polish culture.

We want our creative organisations to free themselves of the pressure brought to bear by reactionary forces, to overcome the situation of having cut themselves off from the working class and the people. We hope that the majority of Polish artists will find the proper road, that they well free themselves of vacillations and with the entire nation participate in the great work of building Socialism. . . .

Revisionism the Main Danger

The Eighth Plenum brought to an end the temporary but severe political crisis within the Party and society. This crisis found expression in the discontent of a part of the working class as well as in the inability of the leading organs of the Party to act uniformly and consistently over a period of several months. The difficulties in Socialist construction in Poland, resulting from objective reasons as well as definite mistakes in Party policy, could have transformed 1956 into a year of severe and dangerous political crisis. This crisis could have been precipitated by:

—dogmatic resistance within a section of the Party leadership, which delayed a consistent solution of burning social problems;

—revisionist tendencies which were mainly expressed in an exaggerated and unrestrained criticism of Party policy, hitting at the basis of Marxism-Leninism and facilitating the agitational work of anti-socialist forces.

A severe ideological struggle against both dogmatism and revisionism was necessary to tide over this crisis and overcome it—a struggle for the consolidation of the Party around a correct Marxist-Leninist political line as laid down by the Eighth Plenum. This struggle brought victory to the Party, at the same time enriching its experience and ideological character. Along with the resolutions of the Eighth Plenum, those of the Ninth and Tenth Plenums had particular importance for the ideological development of the Party.

At the present stage, revisionism is the main danger for the Party; not because of the number of revisionists, but because of the objective association of revisionism with anti-social tendencies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and bourgeois social forces both inside and outside. In our country socialism has not yet been built. Our society is still a class society. There exists in it remnants of old exploiting classes and social groups under the influence of bourgeois political opinions; reactionary opponents of the People's power still exist and act. They are supported by reactionary political émigré groups abroad and imperialist centres with a widely developed propaganda apparatus at their disposal. Reactionary forces internally are not particularly numerous, but they eagerly take advantage of all the difficulties of the People's power in order to heighten their activity.

Two or three years ago, when our Party made the necessary turn in its policy, and for this purpose drew attention to the road covered in the past in order to cast off everything that hindered the march forward, all reactionary forces mobilised themselves, in order to gain advantages for themselves out of criticism of the cult of the individual and self-criticism by distorting the truth and seizing upon fragments of Party statements for their own purposes.

The danger of revisionism, of which the representatives were few but noisy, consisted in the fact that it exerted pressure against the ideological unity of the Party from the inside and sowed disbelief in Communism, in the leading role of the Party and in the dictatorship of the proletariat. In a difficult period for the Party they could have caused severe damage, for instance, through their connections with the media of mass propaganda such as the press, radio, etc. International reaction, among which were certain émigré circles, counted on revisionism, expecting that it would enable them to destroy the unity of our Party and weaken it sufficiently to prepare for the "second stage". That is why the propaganda channels of reaction were directed toward strengthening and spreading the influence of revisionism, treating it as an objective ally.

Fencing with pseudo-leftist phrases, the revisionists most frequently accepted the main elements of social-democratic ideology, treating as revelations, often through ignorance, its old and worn-out principles and ideas such as: idealisation of bourgeois parliamentarism, phrases about integral democracy, enmity toward the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Leninist conception of the leading role of the Party etc.

The revisionists weakened the State of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, counterposing the idea of integral democracy and demanding the "free play of social forces". Our Party has defined its attitude to democracy long ago. In 1944 when we took power, we said: "There is no freedom for the enemies of freedom". Our watchword is democracy for the working people, for the supporters of socialism, and we have been extending this democracy on the basis of the resolutions of the Eighth Plenum. The Party repudiated and condemned revisionist attempts to open the way for the political legality of bourgeois forces.

Seeking for popularity, the revisionists put forward demagogic social slogans and preached various anarchistic conceptions of the organisation of socialist economy which at bottom were aimed against the system of socialist planning and social ownership in industry.

The revisionists directed their blow against the unity of the socialist camp and proletarian internationalism. They tried to use the resolutions of the Eighth Plenum—which were aimed at creating the best possible conditions for strengthening the ties of friendship between Poland and the Soviet Union—in order to unleash anti-Soviet propaganda and make a breach between our two fraternal countries.

The successful resistance which our Party offered revisionism was the necessary condition for a complete victory over dogmatism and sectarianism. There were various factors which gave birth to dogmatism among us: isolation from the masses; lack of understanding of new phenomena in our life and fear of them; inability to understand the specific development of our country and therefore the blind imitation of models of Socialist construction which arose in other periods and under other conditions; treatment of Marxism not as a sign-post for action but as dogma and dead formulae. Revisionism pushed many honest but ideologically weak comrades into the arms of the dogmatists, who with noisy demagogy presented themselves as the only authentic defenders of Marxism and Communism.

Dogmatism in theory gives rise to sectarianism in policy, and, in particular, to tendencies to solve the main contradictions within the people by administrative measures — contradictions which should be solved by means of correct policy and methods of argumentation. A number of good comrades—activists and Party members—who today are carrying out Party policy with full conviction and devotion, in the period of particularly strong reactionary attacks upon the Party and noisy revisionist activity became disoriented, and shut themselves up within the shell of dogmatism. However, the unwavering correctness of the Party's political line, its fidelity to the principles of Marxism, and in particular the support of the masses for the policy of the Party, have resulted in these comrades throwing off this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shell and gradually getting into step with the Party.

It should be stated that if the Party's struggle against revisionism helped to free many active workers from the shell of dogmatism, the liberation of Party policy from dogmatic encrustation, on the other hand, was of tremendous significance for the effectiveness of our struggle against revisionism.

Today we can state that the ideological and organisational consolidation of the Party has in general been achieved. Only an echo of the disputes dividing the Party and paralysing its ability to act is now heard. The unity of the Party, rebuilt and strengthened in the process of consolidation, is its own great achievement. This unity should be strengthened and never in the future should we allow it to be weakened or violated. . . .

The Role of the Party

The Party's strength and its ability to lead, are primarily determined by its links with the working people. The more fully the Party expresses the aspirations of the masses for a better life and just society, the more effectively it undertakes to discharge the tasks which the people themselves consider the most urgent, the more frankly it discusses from day to day delicate and unpopular matters with the working people, and explains what is possible *today* and what will only be possible *tomorrow*, the more the masses will believe the Party.

To yield to wrong demands, to promise "a fool's paradise", has nothing in common with the struggle to strengthen the links with the people. To feed the people with cheap flattery is unworthy of a Party member. It expresses distrust in the working people, in their ability to raise themselves beyond their narrow, immediate interests and understand the broader interests of society. It expresses fear of persistent work to raise the consciousness of the masses, shape their consciousness of the unbreakable unity between their personal fate and that of society, between the interests of individual groups and those of the nation. This is a necessary prerequisite for raising socialist consciousness, which in our conditions, is also patriotic consciousness.

Our Party, as the leader of national life, teaches patriotism in its deepest sense because in all its activity it unites the day-by-day selfless toil of the working people with great socialist and national goals; it unites the present with the future of the country and the nation which is building the indestructible edifice of socialist Poland.

Socialist patriotism is not expressed in words, but first and foremost in persevering, effective work for the country's welfare.

And this was how our appeal to honour the Party Congress with work was understood by the million-strong masses of Polish people.

Miners and factory workers, building and transport workers, engineers and technicians—all understood its significance, and realised scores of thousands of pledges by increasing their work efficiency, making full use of the reserves of increased production, improving the quality of goods manufactured, and so on, thus bringing great benefit to our national economy.

In the rural areas too, the peasants replied to the Party's appeal with voluntary work on drainage and irrigation work, on the production of building materials and on road construction.

Practically universal support is extended by the people to our slogan: "We will build by volunteer effort 1,000 schools for the Thousandth Anniversary of Poland".

I wish here, from this platform, to express on behalf of our Congress and of the Party, our warmest thanks to all those who have replied to our appeal by disinterested and selfless acts. To miners, steel workers, chemical and power workers, metallurgists, building trades workers, textile workers, and those employed in the light industry and communication, to engineers, technicians, scientists, educationists and health service workers, to those who participated in the peasants' voluntary labour in the countryside, and, in particular, to our young people who, in many fields, were in the front ranks of pledge-takers—to all those who participated in patriotic action in honour of the Congress, who joined the all-national campaign to build schools, we convey our deepest appreciation.

All this goes to show that the working people are looking less and less for "manna from heaven", that they are depending on themselves, on their own toil and ingenuity; that there is arising a broad social movement to bring into use all the reserves latent in our industry, our agriculture and in other fields of our life. This movement is a remarkable feature of the times we are now entering. Its development creates a guarantee that our economic tasks are feasible, and may even be considerably surpassed. At the same time it expresses a new political situation favourable to expanding the vanguard influence of the Party.

The essence of the Party's leading role in this situation consists in correctly uniting its leadership tasks with regard to the State and its administrative and economic apparatus, and the political mobilisation of the people, awakening their socialist and patriotic consciousness, developing to the maximum their economic initiative in fulfilling the development plans of the country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discussion contributions:

On the Jewish Question

A. Waterman

COMRADE RAMELSON in his article in the January issue of *Marxism Today*, whilst re-discussing the Jewish issue, makes reference to the recent experiences of the Jewish people, i.e. Hitler's extermination of 6 million Jews, the setting up of the State of Israel, and the elimination of Yiddish cultural activities in the U.S.S.R. in 1948. Nonetheless he does not seem to appreciate the profound impact these experiences have had on the Jewish people.

I want to dwell primarily on the part dealing with the Socialist Solution. It is important to recapitulate, though briefly, this unprecedented historical event. Merely to state that the Soviet Union "in eliminating anti-semitism . . . had a tremendous impact on Jews all over the world" barely touches the significance of the 1917 revolution, as far as the Jews as an oppressed minority were concerned. Surely this was only one aspect of what the young Soviet Union did for the Jewish people.

(1) For the first time in history a revolutionary movement succeeded in removing, at one stroke, all forms of discrimination, economic, political and cultural, by granting the erstwhile oppressed and pogromised Jews full and complete equality.

(2) It made possible in the short period of fifteen years the complete transformation of the social, economic and cultural structure of Soviet Jewry.

(3) "Every facility given to them . . . for the development of Yiddish culture." It was not only a continuation of the old Yiddish culture, but an unprecedented renaissance, transformation and expansion of Yiddish cultural activities which became "national in form and socialist in content".

(4) Economically, it drew masses of Jewish people into the then developing industries. For those who could not be absorbed in industry, it promulgated vast land settlement schemes and brought hundreds of thousands of Jews into agriculture. Large areas of land were specially allocated for Jewish re-settlement, in the Crimea, Ukraine, White Russia and the Caucasus. Jewish administrative regions were formed, such as Kalinindorf, New Zlotopol, Stalindorf, etc., where the official language in the schools, courts and local government was Yiddish.

This economic and social transformation had its immediate and direct effect on cultural expansion. Let me quote a report given at a conference of Jewish cultural workers in 1924 (*Yevrei v SSSR*, p. 262): "There are functioning in the U.S.S.R. fifty-two kindergartens, 439 elementary schools, fifty-six secondary schools, forty-four technical and four pedagogical institutes, all conducted in Yiddish; also four Yiddish faculties attached to Universities." At a similar conference in 1928 the above figures were almost doubled. In 1921, only 21 per cent of Jewish children went to Yiddish schools; by 1932 the figure was 64 per cent. There were at this time forty-two Yiddish newspapers and periodicals, four publishing houses, ten Yiddish state theatres and two theatrical schools. Book publishing in Yiddish experienced a fivefold increase, from seventy-three titles in 1913 to 339 in 1939. Shalom Aleichem's books in Yiddish rose from 220,000 in 1913 to 3,200,000 in 1939. Several radio stations gave many hours to Yiddish broadcasts.

On March 28th, 1928, a government decree set aside Biro-Bijan as a Jewish Autonomous Region, with the view to an eventual formation of a Jewish Socialist Republic, in order that it might "preserve a Yiddish Socialist national culture" (Kalinin).

It was all this which brought about a situation where "sympathy with the Soviet Union was general, and Socialism as a final solution to the Jewish problem was the dominant trend among Jewish workers and many of the middle class . . . whilst Zionism met . . . but with little success". It is in the light of the above-mentioned developments that one has to consider what happened to Yiddish culture in the U.S.S.R. in 1948. To mention in the same breath those who honestly and sincerely question the forced elimination of Yiddish culture in the U.S.S.R., with those who slander the U.S.S.R. and accuse her of practising anti-semitism, is a sleight of hand which encourages the slanderers and bitterly offends the friends of the U.S.S.R.

Let me say clearly and unequivocally that there can be no doubt that a process of integration is taking place in the Soviet Union, that many Jews, particularly of the younger generation, neither speak nor understand Yiddish and have adopted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russian as their mother tongue. No Socialist should oppose such a natural process of integration. But what about the three million who flocked to the Yiddish concerts given sporadically in the U.S.S.R. in 1957 (a figure given by Danilov, Vice-Minister for Culture, to the French Jewish delegation in February, 1958)? Why should these millions, or even thousands, be denied full facilities to publish, speak, see plays, in what is still their mother tongue, namely Yiddish?

Let us analyse Comrade Ramelson's arguments in this matter.

A. "That administrative measures were taken in 1948 *to close down Jewish cultural institutions."*

I can only assume that by "administrative measures" he means the unjust and illegal acts involving the complete elimination of all Yiddish cultural activities, together with almost all their outstanding representatives. Does not the re-establishment of Socialist legality after the Twentieth Congress demand the full rehabilitation and correction of these injustices and illegalities committed during the "cult of the individual" period? Apparently that would be too simple an answer—so Comrade Ramelson must find other reasons to justify the "status quo".

B. "Segregation in the Ghettoes . . . created a specific Yiddish culture depicting Ghetto life."

How abysmally ignorant the above argument is. Those who have any knowledge of this literature will tell you that it was despised by the rich Jews and the Jewish clerics, who referred to it as the "skivvy" of literature, and the gutteral of the tailors, the cobblers, the carpenters, the artisans and the very poor. The rich and the educated spoke Hebrew or the country's language. This gave a special character and poignancy to Yiddish. It became a weapon of the working class and poor Jews, embraced and loved by them, sinking deep into their consciousness and daily life. Ghetto language indeed! One may as well call Negro culture in the U.S.A. a Ghetto culture.

C. "Wherever the Ghetto walls were broken down as in Western Europe and America—Yiddish ceased to develop."

Yet there are still three daily newspapers, three Yiddish theatres, scores of journals, amateur theatrical groups, choirs, Yiddish secondary schools and Yiddish faculties at the universities in the U.S.A. Similarly in France, the Argentine —not to mention the New Democracies, i.e. Poland, Rumania, where one would hardly say that the "ghetto walls" had not been broken down.

D. "With the further development of Socialism . . . Yiddish ceases to be a living tongue . . . and rapidly crumbles."

It would appear that up to 1948 Yiddish was a living language, and that overnight it ceased to be so, by "administrative measures". To quote the President of the Zionist Organisation in support of this theory is the measure of the bankruptcy of evidence available to Comrade Ramelson. The integration which Goldman bemoans and the "survival" he is hoping for has nothing in common with socialist ideas. We do not want the survival of the "love of Zion" or of the culture of the rabbis and the clerics. This is precisely the kind of "survival" which the Yiddish-speaking workers fought against, using Yiddish cultural expression as a weapon.

E. "The breaking-up of concentrated communities . . . brought about a speeding of the process of integration."

There are 500,000 Jews in Moscow, 40,000 in Kiev, Odessa, Minsk, 25,000 in Vilno. Considering that there are about 3 million Jews in the U.S.S.R., one would hardly call these considerable communities a "breaking-up" of concentration.

F. "Justification given for these measures (elimination of Yiddish) is that there was not sufficient demand for it to justify such undertakings."

Yet further on the same page Comrade Ramelson states that "neither financial cost nor the relative smallness of the population of a nationality can be seriously considered as an obstacle to the application of this principle"—namely "the Marxist approach to national culture is not only to permit, but to *facilitate* by every possible means, the fostering and development of all national cultures".

But then Comrade Ramelson goes on to argue: "As we have seen, the Jews are not a nation"; "Yiddish therefore cannot be treated as a national culture."

How devoid this argument is of Leninist principles on the question of nations and languages. "He who does not acknowledge and defend the equality of *nations and languages,* he who does not fight against all forms of national oppression or inequality, is not Marxist or even a Democrat." (*Lenin on the Jewish Question,* p. 14).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lenin does not speak of the equality of national languages, but of nations *and* languages. No Marxist would claim that the Jews in the Soviet Union were at any time a nation; yet if all facilities and help were extended to their culture and language between 1917 and 1948, what change has taken place in their status after 1948 to warrant the cessation and elimination of this culture? Does not the fact that 3 million flocked to Yiddish concerts, the existence of seventy-two Yiddish writers, poets, dramatists, the emergence of twenty young Yiddish writers (products of the Yiddish schools of 1936) prove that there is a demand for its continuation? Of course we should welcome the considerable translations from Yiddish into Russian of very many books. Yet I have not yet come across a coherent Marxist argument why these books, originally written in Yiddish, should never see daylight in their original tongue, nor why Yiddish Soviet writers should have their novels, stories and poems published (in Yiddish) by left-wing publications in capitalist countries (U.S.A. and France) and not in their country of origin, the U.S.S.R.

G. *"The question is raised whether Marxists attempt by artificial means to delay this historical process . . . . of complete cultural integration."*

Surely this is putting the question on its head. I would rather stand it up on its feet. Should Marxists attempt by artificial means to eliminate a living language and culture, by "administrative measures", instead of allowing the historical process of cultural integration to take its natural course? Particularly when Jewish religious practice and organisation is permitted in the U.S.S.R. as of right, why should not Yiddish secular culture and Jewish communal organisations of a secular and socialist character enjoy similar rights?

Now is it true, as Comrade Ramelson states, that "some publications partly in Yiddish and partly in Russian have appeared"? To my knowledge, there has been only one book (limited edition 500 copies), Shalom Aleichem's *The Enchanted Tailor*. The Yiddish is embodied in its illustrations by the Jewish artist Tankhom Kaplan, but the text is in Russian.*

There is no doubt that the problem is being discussed and considered in the U.S.S.R. It is a problem which has been raised again and again by every Jewish progressive delegation which has visited the U.S.S.R. since 1955. Furthermore, there seems to be general support among Soviet writers for the rehabilitation of Yiddish, its publications, theatres, newspapers etc. Of six such delegations which have visited the U.S.S.R. since 1955, almost all have had varying promises made to them:

A. That a newspaper would soon be re-started.

B. That a Yiddish Theatre would be revived.

C. That a Yiddish Almanack would be issued, and book publications resumed.

So far, these have remained promises; it is urgent and high time they were turned into reality. Let us remove this weapon from the hands of the enemies of the Soviet Union and of socialism. Let us counter the pernicious Zionist and reactionary propaganda by reaffirming our belief in socialism as a final solution to the Jewish question, and let us make it once again "the dominant trend among the Jewish workers and many of the middle class".

* We have recently received a copy of a book of selections from Shalom Aleichem's works, printed in Moscow in Yiddish, 30,000 print. *Editor.*

Solly Kaye

THE article on the Jewish problem in the January issue is, in my opinion, the first real attempt for many years to deal in a balanced way with this complex problem.

And I am rather sorry that the first contribution in the discussion, from my old friend and comrade Jack Rosenberg, should be so unhelpful.

Jack puts into Bert Ramelson's article words he didn't use, and then proceeds to knock him for six. That is not really good discussion. Did Bert Ramelson say that "since the Jews are not a nation they cannot be *affected* by the national question" (my emphasis)? Did Ramelson say that "anti-semitism is the main issue" regarding the Jewish problem? Has Ramelson denied that the existence of the State of Israel has played an important part in Jewish life in post-war years? These are but a few of the false bases on which Jack Rosenberg conducts his argument.

As for accusing Bert Ramelson of confusion, I think there is more confusion in Jack's half-page than in much that I have read on this subject in recent years.

We Communists *have* a policy on Israel and on the Jewish problem. The fact that many of us Jews have spent most of our time in the general political struggle, rather than specialising in the Jewish problem, may be the reason that our line is not well enough known. But a "line" there certainly is. It certainly is not, nor ever has been, based on a premise like that of Comrade Rosenberg, that the Jewish workers "were always generally clear-sighted politically."

There is no contradiction between the statement that the "Jews are not a nation" and the statement that "an Israeli nation is rapidly emerging". The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first statement takes the Communist view that Jews are citizens of the country in which they are born and bred. The second, takes the Communist view that if a large number of people have a common territory, economic base, language, culture and way of life, the basis for nationhood exists and will develop. The Zionists take the view that all Jews are citizens of Israel as well as citizens of the countries in which they are born and brought up. That might be convenient for the Zionists and for the wealthy Jews who can travel between Israel and "their" other country, but no Communist can hold this point of view, surely?

I wish comrades like Rosenberg would say what they think our attitude to Israel should be, instead of saying "we must have a positive line". *We have one*. It is that Israel will only develop if it recognises the rights of all its citizens to full equality, that racial discrimination is not acceptable when practised by a German or American, nor is it acceptable when practised by an Israeli Jew. Our line is that Israel must work for the victory of the anti-imperialist forces of the Middle East rather than see itself as a weapon of imperialism against the peoples of the Middle East, hoping to get some scrapings out of the imperialist barrel for doing its dirty work.

Comrade Rosenberg must understand that it is far harder to win British Jews for this view, than it was to win them for action against fascism. For fascism was on their doorstep, murdering their relatives and friends and threatening to murder them, and it didn't take "clearsightedness" to understand that.

But one has to be clearsighted to understand how to combat bourgeois nationalism. British Jews have been fed on it from childhood just as other British workers have. They too have caught the disease that affects *all* British workers to a larger or smaller degree; that considers the Arabs or the Africans unfit to rule themselves. The most common expression one hears from Zionists who try to justify the taking of land from the Arabs is that "they have huge areas and we only want this little strip". A complete disregard for the land, the homes, the history, the background of the Arabs of Palestine who have lived and worked this land for generations.

And when one has relatives and friends in Israel who are flung into a storm centre of world conflict, how easy it is for them to blindly follow Ben Gurion with the jingo parrot cry common to all capitalist countries: "We must support the Government when danger threatens from outside . . . don't rock the boat . . . rely on strength . . . etc. etc."

Jewish workers brought up in imperialist Britain have just as many illusions as other workers. Indeed it could be argued that if there is a higher proportion of Jews in business and petty production than other sections there will be a higher degree of confusion and political backwardness among them than among the workers generally.

There is much room for discussion arising from Bert Ramelson's article. It is interesting to note that it is not only Communists who are rediscussing this problem, though most Communists are agreed on fundamentals. The leading Jewish religious authorities have for months been at loggerheads with the Government of Israel in defining "What is a Jew?" Yet many of these are foremost critics of the Soviet Union for its refusal to develop "Jewish Culture". If they can't agree what is a Jew, how can they know precisely what is Jewish culture. I am sure that as time goes on, and providing we can maintain peace, a specific *Israeli* culture will develop. But it is clear that in countries like Britain, America and France there is less and less distinction between the culture of Jews and that of the rest of the peoples of that country. Religious distinction, yes. Cultural distinction, no.

Many Jews, and others, fall for a vague, sentimental, mystical approach to the Jewish question. Because of this they refuse to accept facts and search for some mystical line. Even a man as brilliant as Einstein spoke about Jews having "a common love of social justice" giving Marx, Spinoza and Heine as examples of Jews in different historical periods with these qualities. But are they typical? Einstein went wrong because he had no class approach to the Jewish problem. "A common love of social justice" when the banker millionaire Bernard Baruch is one of the major backers of the anti-democratic policies of the U.S. Government? When the scientist Edward Teller perverts his science to the making of more horrible H-bombs to forward U.S. foreign policy? When the Jewish Judge Kauffman can sentence the heroic Julius and Ethel Rosenberg to a horrible death for upholding the principles of honesty, decency and peace?

It is a phoney science that tries to find a common bond between all Jews in class society. There can be a common bond for limited objectives as there was during the war against Hitler. But that common bond existed not only between Jews of all classes but between other peoples of different classes too.

I was particularly interested in the sections of Bert Ramelson's article dealing with the nationalist trend and Israel, for as I have said above there is greater confusion on this among Jews than on any other subject.

Today Israel is one of the greatest testing grounds exposing the falseness of the "common ideology" theory. Here the classes are as bitterly divided as in any capitalist country in spite of the fact that the workers are subject to as great a barrage of chauvinist propaganda as anywhere else in the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where is "the fair play and love of justice" when the Government of Israel can blatantly support the policies of Eisenhower, join in an aggression by the side of British and French imperialism, deny the rights of Israeli Arabs not only to their land, their homes, a job and a future, but even to the elementary right in the land of their birth to move from one town to another without official passes? Do we condemn apartheid in Africa but not in Israel?

How many Jews in Britain today—yes, even many who boast of being Socialist, of their love of justice, of their desire to see a Jewish Socialist State in Israel—have raised a finger against the anti-Arab discrimination that takes place there? How many protested at the murder of forty-nine Arab citizens, men and women, old and young, in Kfar Qassem by the border police (judgment was long delayed and in the course of it Judge Halevi read "Segen Dehan shot them in cold blood deliberately and without any justification"). A common love of social justice?

In Israel today huge new taxes have been imposed upon the people to pay for what the Government chooses to call "the Sinai Campaign" and for the future military adventures that Israel's ruling circles look forward to. This is leading to an increasing number of strikes and growing hardship among the people.

Railway workers recently worked to rule demanding a general rise in pay and won. Tel Aviv port workers struck in order to win the same pay as workers at Haifa. Thousands in the Israeli diamond polishing industry struck for a cost-of-living allowance and won. Jerusalem transport workers struck against so-called "efficiency dismissals" and won the reinstatement of their mates. Even secondary school teachers throughout the country struck during the whole month of October and gained part of their demand for wage increases.

These examples show that the class struggle continues, whether in Britain, America or Israel, while capitalism is the system under which we live. For those Jews who really do love social justice there are some urgent and immediate tasks.

There *is* indeed a clear line, a positive line that Jack Rosenberg and others ask for. To win working class and progressive Jews away from blind loyalty and support of the present Government of Israel. To show our desire for Israeli prosperity by demanding that it pursue a policy of peace and non-discrimination against non-Jewish Israelis. To demand that Israel plays its part as one of the growing number of nations struggling for peace, rather than allow itself to be used as a base for imperialist war and against the independence of the peoples of the Middle East. This is the way to assure security and safety for Israel.

And in Britain the test of whether a Jew is a lover of social justice and progress will be the degree to which he joins in the general fight for peace, for the liberation of the colonial peoples and for socialism. The threat of the H-bomb is in every way a danger to world Jewry as great or greater than was fascism. But this is not easily understood by many Jews, or they would not have so easily joined the war whoops over Suez. That is what makes the work of the Communist Party so important and the responsibility of Communist Jews in particular, so great.

On Higher Education

RARELY has an article on higher education been so concise, so much needed, and above all so exclusively revealing as to what the future has in store, as the one by Sam Lilley in *Marxism Today* (January 1959). The ground covered was so very extensive that it might appear almost absurd to attempt to add to it. Nevertheless that is my intention, for though I entirely agree with what has already been written, I noticed that the author introduced certain questions such as the role of television in popularising educational propaganda, and in a slightly different manner a point questioning various present-day trends concerning specialisation in the universities. The purpose behind raising these issues was, I feel, to develop more discussion around them. Might I strongly recommend that the article by Sam Lilley be read in conjunction with the pamphlet on education issued by the Communist Party in 1958!

In both cases stress was laid on many identical factors. That the money needed in order to develop our educational system existed, at present, in the form of expenditure on a vast and totally unnecessary scale on armaments. The class bias of the present educational system in Britain was brought out, and does not I feel have to be reiterated here. Above all it was emphasised that a socialist policy regarding education is concerned precisely with the expansion of educational opportunity at all levels.

More and more the "11-plus" examination is being challenged. It seems that selection starts very much earlier, more often than not. I myself would rate the "11-plus" as low as a fraud. The purpose here is to artificially select the "types" who could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

benefit from further education. Such people are the ones best able, after suitable "indoctrination", to administer in various fields (such as the civil service, the courts, many religious institutions, industry and commerce, not to mention the parliamentary sphere) in the interests of those whose interests by their very nature are most opposed to and removed from the interests of the vast majority of the people. The trend originates and becomes consolidated shortly afterwards by the "streaming" results from the "11-plus" examination and the subsequent segregation (comparable in a way to Little Rock) of the "now" brighter grades from the "masses" as it were. We are correct to condemn this form of examination.

But equally university entrance is gained by examination. I am unconvinced that one of the criteria determining a person's suitability for a university place ought to be the ability to compress more information into his head (often only for a short while) than his competitor for that place was able to do. After all it is still held quite often (and this I know from my own personal experience) that a technical college is a rather less desirable establishment to have studied at than a university when it comes to getting a job. In passing might I add a note slightly off my main point regarding examinations, that often it is the technical college which is able to offer the most comprehensive syllabus.

We are in every way right to seek the ways and means to greatly extend the number of university places available, but alongside such a demand must go a complementary demand to change the examination procedure whereby entry may be gained to the university. The G.C.E. at "O" or "A" level is by no means the sole yardstick by which suitability for a place should be measured. Often people who for one reason or another *nowadays* are unable to sit successfully for examinations leading to university entrance surely possess other knowledge by which means they ought to be able to secure a university place. The events in the so-called "backward" nations such as the People's Democracies and the Chinese "Commune" system surely bear out this possibility.

However, socialism is still to be looked forward to in Britain. Therefore we must adjust ourselves to conditions as they exist today. Nevertheless an advance would be recorded if we were able to develop the idea that the existing examinations necessary for university entrance are by no means the only ones possible. Such factors as general intelligence and general knowledge need very much to be taken into account. In addition, could not a system be devised which enabled continual assessment to be made on all potential candidates for a university place based on their written work at school, their general interests and all-round activities, social (in the widest possible sense), academic, political, sporting and cultural?

I claim no specialised knowledge of the possibilities. But I do believe, as a Communist, that there are always possibilities for changes in all spheres.

C. DUKES.

Note on The Formation of Nations

IN connection with the discussion on the question of nationality in Africa and the contributions of B. R. Mann and J. M. Warren, readers may be interested to hear of a new study which has been published by the Leningrad orientalist, Dr. Vyacheslav Misyugin.

In this study Dr. Misyugin asserts that an East African nation is in the process of formation on the basis of the Swahili language, now the native language of over 30 million people in the coastal strip of East Africa between the Ruwuma Estuary and the Lamu Archipelago.

It is used not only by the Swahili people inhabiting the narrow coastal strip but also by the people of Zanzibar, Pemba, Mafia, Pate, Lamu and other islands and is also to be met beyond East Africa, in Rhodesia and the mining area of the Belgian Congo.

The Soviet scientist proves in his work that the class society and the ancient towns developed independently in the Swahili country, and not in consequence of the colonisation of the coast by Arab traders.

Dr. Misyugin says that a study of the Swahili language in the past and at present and the existence of an ancient written language and literature in the country are evidence of a rich and original culture.

The well known Soviet African specialist Professor Dmitry Olderogge said in his opinion Dr. Misyugin's work is an interesting, novel and well argued approach to the problem, throwing considerable light on the real history of East Africa.

This study is part of a much larger monograph on the Swahili people on which Dr. Misyugin is now working.

SAM RUSSELL.

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.) Beechwood Rise, Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Economic School
Wortley Hall, near Sheffield
September 12th to 19th

BRITISH CAPITALISM IN 1959

1. Economic Crises
2. Welfare State
3. Nationalisation and Socialist Policy

CHINESE ECONOMIC GROWTH

Lecturers include:
R. Bellamy, J. R. Campbell,
John Eaton

Cost £7

Apply:
Economic Sub-Committee
16 King Street,
London, W.C.2

A. L. Morton Lionel Munby

James Klugmann

lecture at the Holiday School

on

"BRITISH LABOUR HISTORY"

to be held at

WORTLEY HALL

near Sheffield

August 22nd to 29th, 1959

Cost £7

Children Welcome

Apply:
The Education Department,
Communist Party,
16 King Street,
London, W.C.2

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Collet's enlarged
LONDON BOOKSHOP

OPEN at

Long

Last!

Entirely modernised.

Titles in
ECONOMICS · POLITICS
PHILOSOPHY · HISTORY
and LITERATURE for the

Socialist's library.

**64 & 66 Charing Cross Road,
London, W.C.2**

Telephone No.: TEMple Bar 6306

THE SOVIET SCHOOL OF CHESS

by A. Kotov and M. Yudovich

The first thorough study of Soviet chess available to English readers. Soviet method of play and its contribution to chess theory; biographies of all leading players; illustrative games and positions.

380 pp. **13s 6d**

REMINISCENCES OF MARX AND ENGELS

This collection contains reminiscences by contemporaries of Marx and Engels - figures in the international working class movement, friends and colleagues of Marx and Engels, relatives of Marx.

402 pp. **8s**

Coming shortly

FREDERICK ENGELS

by Yelena Stepanova

Written by the Deputy Director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Moscow, this biography reveals many details of Engels' life not included in previous biographies. Translated by John Gibbons.

271 pp. **4s 6d**

Distributed by

**CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Grays Inn Road
London, W.C.1**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED